

FIFTY-FOURTH YEAR.

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

MAR 13 - 1916

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

EDITORS:

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT, JUDSON SMITH,
AND W. G. BALLANTINE.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

EDWARDS A. PARK, W. M. BARBOUR, E. C. BISSELL, F. B. DENIO,
C. F. THWING, D. W. SIMON, AND ARCHIBALD DUFF.

VOL. XLI. - - - - JULY 1884.

OBERLIN, OHIO :

PUBLISHED BY E. J. GOODRICH.

ANDOVER: W. F. DRAPER. LONDON: TRÜBNER AND CO.

1884.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1884, by E. J. Goodrich, in the Office
of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

THE

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

ARTICLE I.

CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE AND LIFE.¹

BY REV. D. W. SIMON, D.D., PRINCIPAL OF THE THEOLOGICAL HALL,
EDINBURGH, SCOTLAND.

LESS than half a century ago it was usual in the pulpits of Congregational churches to treat Christian life as dependent on Christian doctrine. Most sermons began accordingly with an exposition of doctrine, and ended with a practical application. It was deemed necessary first to set forth principles, reasonings; then to appeal to the will and the emotions.

Some twenty-five or more years ago a decided reaction set in, and at the present moment it is almost the fashion to treat Christian doctrine as having very little to do with the Christian life. Hence an ever louder demand for "practical" preaching; hence the denunciation of all "doctrinal" preaching, whether orthodox or heterodox; hence too, in part, the desire, or at all events, readiness, either to shorten or altogether omit the sermon, and to substitute what is called "worship" in its stead — a worship which threatens to become, to a large extent, little more than aestheticism tinged with religiosity. Perhaps the majority of the most widely read sermons now published, if we except those of Spurgeon, are markedly non-doctrinal in character. I do not mean that they lack disciplined thought, but that they eschew or even make light of the incursions into the domain of systematic

¹ An Address delivered at the Annual Meeting of Spring Hill Congregational College, Birmingham, England.

ARTICLE IX.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

A PLAIN INTRODUCTION TO THE CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, for the use of Biblical Students. By F. H. A. Scrivener, Prebendary of Exeter, Vicar of Hendon. Third Edition, thoroughly revised, enlarged, and brought down to the present date. 8vo. pp. xxxix, 712, with fourteen plates. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co. 1883.

The services which Dr. Scrivener has rendered to biblical criticism in his almost forty years of devotion to its study have won him a place in the memory and gratitude of scholars which must always remain green. His "Plain Introduction," in particular, has been for a quarter of a century *the* book on its subject. The first edition (1861) was nothing less than an astonishing performance, when the circumstances under which it was compiled are taken into account. Von Gebhardt in 1881 knew nothing more comprehensive or better to which to direct German scholars than the second edition. The third edition is a marked improvement on the second. It contains one hundred and twenty-five more pages, and these are simply packed with new matter. It catalogues more than three hundred new manuscripts. And the revising as well as adding hand is everywhere visible. It easily remains the most complete work in the field, and as such indispensable to scholars.

Less than this could not be said without distinct injustice. But it is the function of critics to find fault. And we feel bound to add that the volume before us is far from what it should be and might have been,—is, indeed, no less than a great disappointment to all who have either the science of criticism or the reputation of Dr. Scrivener at heart. The truth must be sorrowfully confessed that the science has outrun the book, and that the remarkable youth of 1861 has developed into a far less noteworthy man in 1883. Readers need to be specially warned against three distinct faults: an affluence of petty errors of fact; a strange neglect of the recent literature of the subject, and uncritical choice and use of what is noted; and a painful wavering of judgment and inconsistency of statement that leave the reader in doubt as to what is really intended to be taught.

It is no part of our plan to attempt a catalogue of these errors and inconsistencies. Our space would scarcely contain them, and the task is not congenial to our taste. Our duty to the reader is performed in putting him duly on his guard against them. Some of them are suffi-

ciently curious, however, to invite attention. For instance, let us suppose the unwary reader to turn to this volume in order to learn the relative values of the various versions for critical use. He reads on pp. 308-9, "The Peshito Syriac and Old Latin translations must be placed in the very first rank as authorities and aids for the critical revision of the text. In a class apart from and next below the Peshito Syriac and Old Latin we may group together the Egyptian, the Curetonian Syriac, the Latin Vulgate, the Gothic, the Armenian, and Aethiopic versions, which we name in what seems to be their order in respect to value." This is direct and plain, though far from true. What is the student to think, however, when he reaches p. 360, and reads, "Both as a translation and as an aid to the criticism of the text of the New Testament the Vulgate is far superior to the Old Latin"; to say nothing now of Bishop Lightfoot's words (which are left unexplained to the mystification of the learner) on pp. 392 and 400, "Of all the versions the Memphitic is perhaps the most important for the textual critic" and "[The Thebaic version's] textual value is perhaps only second to the Memphitic among the early versions." Perhaps the most particularly confused statements are made as to the Beza editions. We cannot refrain from hoping that some explanation may be possible for some of these misstatements; but at present Dr. Scrivener seems to apologize for having here counted as Beza's first edition the work that was really his first; to count now as his first edition a work that has no Greek text in it at all, and to profess to have drawn in 1860 his quotations from a copy of an edition which nobody else appears to have ever seen. Dr. Scrivener certainly owes it to bibliographical science, as well as to his own credit, to print the full title and a thoroughly unambiguous description of the London Beza of 1565. It is a puzzle to his readers that seems to demand clearing up.

It is pleasanter to point out the most important improvements of this edition. One of these is, of course, found in the list of cursive mss., a field which Dr. Scrivener has made particularly his own, and in which he has had the efficient aid of Dean Burgon. Diligent research has enabled the author to correct many previous mistakes here, and fill in many previous blanks; while, chiefly owing to Dean Burgon's investigations, a long list of mss. not hitherto catalogued has been added. The section on the Latin versions has been very greatly improved, and brought, indeed, fairly up to date. The section on the Egyptian versions in its revised form remains quite the best accessible. Over the account of the Syriac versions, on the other hand, one would like to draw a veil of silence. A totally erroneous view of the history of the Syriac versions is taken; old errors are repeated and new ones made; while in his zeal to demonstrate the post-Peshito origin of the Curetonian Dr. Scrivener's uncritical use of recent literature reaches its culmination in his four-fold serious appeal to the authority of the admirable hoax with which the

Abbé Martin, in a freak of lunacy or in a flash of satire (at all events it is good satire), astonished the learned world last year.

No portion of the volume will be turned to with more interest than the polemic against the principles of Drs. Westcott and Hort (pp. 530-542). This is brief, much briefer than was to be expected, and moves too much on the surface to be of real value. Indeed, nearly half of it is devoted rather to the pamphlet of "Two members of the New Testament company of Revisers" on the Revision and the Greek Text of the New Testament, whose brief and semi-popular arguments it was no doubt more convenient to handle. There is evidence nowhere that Dr. Hort's methods have been seriously studied, or indeed even entirely understood, much less subjected to any thorough testing. It is clear that Dr. Scrivener means to be fair; but no student could obtain the faintest conception of Dr. Hort's principles from him. Even such diverse processes as genealogical evidence and internal evidence of groups are jumbled hopelessly together in the exposition, with the most grossly unfair effect. Results obtained by Dr. Hort by internal evidence of groups—which it must be emphasized is a method of criticism totally independent of and different in kind from genealogical evidence, and which will stand as a valid and necessary method of dealing with the evidence, no matter what becomes of his theory of "recensions"—are presented by Dr. Scrivener as if obtained by the genealogical method; and his reader, when he lays aside the volume, may truly profess not to have so much as heard whether there be any internal evidence of groups. We are obliged to say that we cannot find Dr. Hort at all in the eight pages of professed exposition of his methods. Dr. Scrivener's neglect to familiarize himself with his methods leads him to do them injustice also elsewhere than in this formal account of them; as, for instance, on p. 604, where he tells us that Dr. Hort has omitted Luke xxiii. 34, "chiefly because D is considered specially weighty in its omissions and B has to be held up, in practice if not in profession, as virtually almost impeccable." This "virtually almost" spiteful language is difficult to explain or pardon. Dr. Hort gives a long note on the passage and assigns quite other reasons. And any knowledge of Dr. Hort's general method would suggest two very good grounds for assigning much more weight to BD in the Gospels than can be represented by B+D. Genealogically they are representatives of two totally different classes, and the combination is therefore the union of the classes. By internal evidence of groups, too, the combination proves itself excellent.

When we turn from Dr. Scrivener's exposition of the principles of others and ask after his own we are thrown into considerable perplexity. He does, indeed, give us, on p. 557, four practical rules which he tells us, with some pride, have been commended by Canon Kennedy. "(1) That the true readings of the Greek New Testament cannot safely be derived

from any one set of authorities, whether manuscripts, versions, or fathers, but ought to be the result of a patient comparison and careful estimation of the evidence supplied by them all. (2) That where there is a real agreement between all documents containing the Gospels up to the sixth century, and in other parts of the New Testament up to the ninth, the testimony of later manuscripts and versions, though not to be rejected unheard, must be regarded with great suspicion; and, **UNLESS UPHELD BY STRONG INTERNAL EVIDENCE**, can hardly be adopted. (3) That where the more ancient documents are at variance with each other, the later uncial and cursive copies, especially those of approved merit, are of real importance, as being the surviving representatives of other codices, very probably as early, perhaps even earlier, than any now extant. (4) That in weighing conflicting evidence we must assign the highest value not to those readings that are attested by the greatest number of witnesses, but to those which come to us from several remote and independent sources, and which bear the least likeness to each other in respect to genius and general character." These, however, do not carry us very far, and when not truisms are for the most part not true. The first is universally accepted and acted upon. The second, down to 'suspicion' is a solemn platitude, and fixes the dates arbitrarily and without the shadow of a reason; while after that word it simply legitimatizes the pure conjectures with the emphasis of small capitals. The third is meaningless and unsound. No one will deny that the cursive type of text is as old as the fourth century, but that will hardly prove that a witness who has been shown to be a mere repeater can be profitably called in to settle every dispute. The fourth is sound or unsound according to the sense given to the phrase "remote and independent sources." Dr. Scrivener means it *geographically*, in which case the rule is neither applicable nor true, as he himself elsewhere admits, telling us truly enough, at p. 577, that the united testimony of the Old Latin, of the Curetonian Syriac, and of Codex D are quite insufficient in themselves to prove any more than that the reading they exhibit is ancient." Yet geographically North Africa and Syria are about as far apart as documents can get. For that matter, however, Dr. Scrivener does not honor any one of his four rules with uniform allowance.

It is a somewhat interesting task, in fact, to pick out from chapter ix., where examples of the application of criticism are given, the real principles which Dr. Scrivener arrives at. How, for instance, do these three rules sound together? "We cannot resist the five great uncials when they are in harmony" (p. 618); "The chief uncials sometimes conspire in readings which are unquestionably false, and can hardly have arisen independently of each other" (p. 644); "The great uncials seldom or never conspire in exhibiting a really valuable departure from the later codices unless supported by some of the best of the cursives themselves"

(p. 645). All three cannot be true; but Dr. Scrivener treats them impartially enough. He does resist the five great uncials, as e.g. in 2 Cor. iii. 3, where he rejects *καρδιας*, although it is read by *αBACD* *EGLP* and most cursives; or in Phil. ii. 1, where he refuses *τις*, although it is read by all uncials and nearly all cursives. He does follow the great uncials without the support of some of the best cursives, as e.g. not only in Acts xiii. 32, but also in Mark v. 36 and elsewhere. He does not, on the other hand, always follow the great uncials, even when supported by the best cursives, as e.g. in John i. 18; Luke vi. 1; Acts xiii. 18; 1 Cor. xi. 24; 1 Thess. ii. 7, etc.

Clearly these are not the rules which give the hinge on which Dr. Scrivener's criticism turns. We think we come nearer to it in the following: "We do not hesitate to receive a variation supported by only a few first-rate authorities where internal evidence pleads powerfully in its favor" (p. 581); and more significantly still: "Internal evidence being equiponderant, we must decide by the weight of documentary proof" (p. 625). We speak subject to correction, but apparently this represents his actual practice; it is only when internal evidence is "equiponderant" that he appears to trouble himself much over the "documentary proof." It is thus that he is able to adopt readings against any and every combination of documents, even, as in Phil. ii. 1, against all uncials and nearly all cursives combined. It is quite consistent for him to assign as the reason for a change of opinion since edition second (at Mark vi. 20) that the other reading "now appears to him to afford an excellent sense." He is able, no doubt, to say very truly at p. 553: "The study of grouping has been recently and not untruly said to be the foundation of all enduring criticism." But very little fruit is reaped from the admission. The foundation and hinge, almost the totality of Dr. Scrivener's criticism, practically sums itself up in internal evidence of readings. In this we find explanation enough of the infirmity and waveringness of his conclusions.

The extent to which the inconsistency of his treatment of the external evidence might be illustrated is limited only by the number of passages on which he has passed judgment. *αBDZ* 1. 17 + *Memph.*, *Vulg.*, most Old Latin codices, are resisted in Matt. vi. 13; and *αBDL* 1. 22. 604. *Memph.*, *Vulg.*, most Old Latin codices, Curetonian and Jerusalem Syriac are followed at Matt. xix. 17 (in ed. 2; in ed. 3 Dr. Scrivener is more doubtful). Again *αBL* *Memph.* are rejected in Mark vi. 20, and *αBLΔ* accepted in v. 36; *αBAC* 17. 67** are rejected in 1 Cor. xi. 24, and *α*ABC** 17 (67**) accepted in 1 Cor. xi. 29. In the Apocalypse A, three mss. of the *Vulg.* and one of the Slavonic are followed at xiii. 1, while AC 38^m 48. 90, best mss. of the *Vulg.*, are rejected at xv. 6; or An^o 38, Irenaeus's Latin, are followed at xxi. 6, while *αABC* 95 + *Memph.* are rejected at xviii. 3. Dr. Scrivener strangely speaks of conjectures on p. 490 as if it were agreed that they never should be resorted to;

but himself comes perilously near resorting to them in more instances than one. He finds it at times most necessary to assume two authoritative editions of the New Testament books in order to ease his difficulties! (See p. 608, 610 *et al.*)

It will be observed, then, that Dr. Scrivener's book cannot be depended on to teach either the science or the art of textual criticism. We can congratulate ourselves that he has not thought it his duty to edit the continuous text. It is as a collection of the materials for criticism, a handbook of the sources, that it is valuable. Here, despite its many defects, it has no real rival in comprehensiveness and completeness. But even here its short-comings are sufficiently numerous and serious to demand a fourth edition, thoroughly revised and brought really up to date. It seems to us that we ought to have this at once.

THE THEORY OF MORALS. By Paul Janet, Member of the Institute, Author of "Final Causes," etc. Translated from the latest French edition by Miss Mary Chapman, under the supervision of President Noah Porter of Yale College. 8vo. pp. 490. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1883.

This volume is refreshing to a reader who finds something more in obligation and duty than mere instincts and sentiments developed in a sentient being by the reaction of his environment. The work treats of ethics from a rational or intuitional standpoint, assuming the validity of necessary truths, and provides a distinct and vital meaning for such words as duty, desert, conscience, and the like.

As is usual with French philosophical writers, the style of the author is decidedly luminous, and does not become obscure or involved even in the most abstruse discussions. He does not seem at any time bewildered with the profundity of other writers, and, what is more rare, not often even with his own. There is abundant illustration and repetition; more, perhaps, than would be expected in a distinctively scientific treatise; but for the general reader this rather adds to the interest than detracts from it. To one interested in the questions of which it treats it is a very enjoyable book to read. The work of translation has been done so successfully that the usual traces of the process rarely appear.

The author has a facility of putting himself in the place of others while presenting their views, to such a degree that the reader is sometimes left in doubt for a half page or more whether the idea presented is finally to be accepted by the author or controverted. He appreciates whatever he sees of value in the views of others, and gives them a fair statement.

The problem which the author proposes to solve is the one which has faced every writer on morals since the earliest ages; viz. How does obligation arise? What is its foundation? This problem the author resolves into three, as follows (p. 2): "What is good? What is duty? What is