



THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME IX

JULY 1911

NUMBER 3

THE MAKING OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE.¹

The task assigned is a delightful and a simple one. It is to review briefly, and in bare outline, a story which, in its fulness, is as fascinating as it is familiar. The whole story could not be told. It leads us forward in thought to work not yet complete, for men will continue to produce English versions of the Bible; and as we look backward, we are led through the labors of translators and copyists and saints and apostles and prophets to the very mind of God its Author and its Source. The character of this occasion and the necessary limitations of time confine our review to that portion of the process which was accomplished by men of England and which culminated in the production of that version, which, for three hundred years, has been in reality the Bible of the English-speaking world.

The interest centres about three great names: John Wiclif, William Tyndale, and King James the First. Of course there are others which we must mention and which we should hold in grateful remembrance to-day.

We might allow ourselves the pleasure of rehearsing the story, familiar to us all from childhood, of Caedmon the untutored keeper of cattle at the Abbey of Whitby, who leaves the banquet hall, when the harp is being passed, because he cannot sing; but as he falls asleep in the stable

¹ An address at the Tercentenary Celebration of the Publication of the Authorized Version, Princeton, May 9, 1911.

μακάριοι οἱ μὴ ἰδόντες καὶ πιστεύσαντες. This passage proves that he cannot have intended an earthly seeing, etc., in I John i. 1."

Dom Chapman says: "I suppose I must answer what needs no answer: In John i. 18 it is denied that any one can see God *as He is* (the beatific vision), whereas in 3 John 11 the writer speaks of a mystical friendship with God by contemplation such as holy souls can attain in this life; the distinction is obvious enough, for the first passage simply repeats the Old Testament view, while the other means *ἔώρακεν* in the sense of 'know' (as John xiv. 9, where οὐκ ἔγνωκάς με; is followed by ὁ ἔωρακὼς ἐμὲ ἔώρακεν τὸν πατέρα), the spiritual knowledge of God obtained by knowing Jesus Christ. Again, in John xx. 29 faith in the Resurrection without sight is praised, as being a more perfect faith; but it is not said that having known of Christ in the flesh is not a great advantage, nor is it in the least suggested that it is better not to have been a personal disciple! In I John i. 1 there is not a word about faith, and the writer is simply asseverating with all his might that he had been a personal disciple and that this witness is to be depended upon. If we say 'he cannot have intended an earthly seeing, etc.,' in this verse, we must say that he could not mean an earthly seeing in John xix. 34-5: 'and immediately there came forth blood and water, and he who saw it hath borne witness' (cp. I John v. 6-9)."

Princeton.

WILLIAM P. ARMSTRONG.

THE BIBLE FOR HOME AND SCHOOL. COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS by BENJAMIN W. BACON, D.D., LL.D., Buckingham Professor of New Testament Criticism and Exegesis in Yale University. New York. The Macmillan Company, 1909. Pp. vii, 135.

In accordance with the plan of the series, this commentary presupposes no knowledge of Greek and is intended for the use of the general reader. It would, however, be a mistake to suppose that it is altogether easy reading. On the contrary, the very brevity of the work has in the case of a writer so full of ideas as Professor Bacon not always been in the interests of perfect clearness. Where the author has allowed himself more room, as for example in Appended Note B., pp. 118ff., his discussion is more illuminating.

In the introduction and in the appended note just mentioned, particular attention has been devoted to the relation between Galatians and Acts (compare the same writer's articles in the *American Journal of Theology*, 1907, pp. 454-474, and 1909, pp. 59-76). The comparison results very much to the discredit of the latter. Acts is found to manifest the "strongly idealizing tendency of the post-apostolic age", in the first place by representing Paul as applying his gospel of "justification apart from works of the law" not to Jews and not even to himself but only to Gentiles, and in the second place by representing Paul as subordinate to the original apostles. In accordance with his purpose the author of Acts has suppressed Paul's original personal con-

ference with the apostles (Gal. ii, cf. Acts xi. 30, xii. 25), which took place really before the so-called first missionary journey, and has introduced a conference at which Paul appears merely as a delegate of the church at Antioch, and at the instance of the church at Jerusalem agrees to require his Gentile converts to make concessions to the Jewish Christians. It is true, Professor Bacon continues, that second conference has a basis in fact. Paul's personal conference with the original apostles had settled the matter of Gentile freedom from the law, but it had determined no *modus vivendi* in mixed communities. How were the Jewish Christians to preserve their ceremonial purity according to the law and yet hold fellowship with Gentile converts? Paul answered this question by requiring the Jewish Christians in such cases to relinquish their ceremonial purity; the Jerusalem church answered it by the so-called apostolic decrees, which were determined upon in Paul's absence and altogether without his consent. These decrees required not the Jewish Christians but the Gentile Christians to make concessions. The Gentile Christians, though not required to accept circumcision (the original apostles never thought of requiring that, for it would have been manifestly absurd), must abstain from certain things which according to the law would be the most serious obstacles in the way of table companionship with loyal Jews. It was the attempt of "certain men from James" (Gal. ii. 12) to introduce these decrees into Antioch which produced the serious break between Paul on the one hand and Peter, Barnabas and the Antiochian church on the other, which is mentioned in Gal. ii. 11ff., but is suppressed by the author of Acts.

There is a certain attractiveness in such a theory. Professor Bacon's reconstruction of the Apostolic Age is in some respects perhaps easier to understand than the one which results from a more docile attitude towards the sources. Simplicity, however, is no guarantee of historicity. The question is whether Professor Bacon has not substituted the comfortable simplicity of fiction for the baffling complexity of fact. And one thing is incomprehensible even in Professor Bacon's theory—the refined subtlety of dissimulation displayed by the author of Acts. A difference of point of view as compared with Paul may freely be admitted. Indeed in connection with a minor detail, Professor Bacon has himself indicated the true method of harmonizing the two accounts. Paul says (Gal. ii. 2) that he went up to the conference with the apostles by revelation; Acts fortunately supplies the historical occasion by mentioning the Judaizing activity at Antioch (Acts xv. 1). Here Professor Bacon himself admits that there is no "*suppressio veri*". There were external reasons that pressed upon Paul; but he would not have yielded to them except by divine direction. If this method of interpretation be applied more extensively, the contradiction between Paul and Acts will disappear.

Professor Bacon's defence of the South Galatian theory of the address of the Epistle suffers particularly on account of the unsatisfactory treatment of Acts xvi. 6 and xviii. 23. Those verses are

crucial in the whole discussion, but an adequate interpretation of them was hardly possible in a popular work. It is very doubtful whether Gal. iv. 13 can be made to favor the South Galatian view. When Paul says that he preached to the Galatians the former time on account of an infirmity of the flesh, Professor Bacon takes this to mean necessarily that Paul *went* to Galatia on account of illness, and argues that he would not have gone to so remote a district as North Galatia if he had been ill. The passage may mean equally well that Paul *remained* in Galatia on account of illness instead of carrying out an original intention of passing through. At any rate, this interpretation is commonly adopted by the advocates of the North Galatian theory and should not have been altogether ignored.

In Appended Note C, the author states his moral influence theory of the atonement. It is not at all surprising that Professor Bacon advocates such a theory, but it is somewhat more surprising that he attributes it to Paul. For in other respects, he is not at all concerned about defending Paul against the charge of being antiquated. The elimination of the deeper significance of the cross is particularly hard to accomplish in the Epistle to the Galatians. The cross which merely displays God's condemnation of sin and love for the sinner was not the one upon which Paul was crucified unto the world. Gal. iii. 13 ("Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us") is touched upon by Professor Bacon rather lightly. Paul's death unto the law is attenuated until it means merely the despair resulting from moral struggle; his crucifixion together with Christ means merely the act of faith with its agony of separation from the law. In a word, the tremendous teaching of the Epistle is rationalized away in a manner rather surprising in these days of grammatico-historical exegesis. If Paul's gospel were only what Professor Bacon supposes it to have been, the Galatians are hardly to be blamed for falling away. No wonder "the spectacle of Jesus Christ crucified by the very legalism to which they are now invited" did not deter them. What really made Paul marvel was their defection from a cross that had satisfied the law's demands and given them freedom from its awful curse.

The appeal which such a commentary makes to the general reader—"to intelligent Sunday School teachers"—may serve at least one useful purpose. It may help to dispel the astonishing indifference of the American branch of the Church toward historical questions. When such a view of the New Testament as that of Professor Bacon has been transmitted through Sunday School teachers to the rising generation, it will produce a Christianity very different from the religion that has formerly been designated by that name. Professor Bacon's little book should prove even to the most "practical" man that the popularization of the naturalistic view of Christianity is inevitable. No such proof, however, should really have been required; for the march of ideas—false as well as true ideas—is irresistible. New Testament criticism, with all its technicalities, with all its array of strange

German names, even when it has not yet emerged from its academic seclusion is a very practical thing.

Princeton.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN.

THE ETHICS OF ST. PAUL. By ARCHIBALD B. D. ALEXANDER, M.A., Author of "*A Short History of Philosophy.*" 8vo; pp. xxiv, 377. The Macmillan Company, 66 Fifth Avenue, New York. 1910. Price, \$2.00 net.

For a quarter of a century the emphasis has been on Biblical as distinguished from systematic theology. This is becoming true of Christian ethics. It is being presented in the order and form of its historical development. Fifteen years ago Dr. W. S. Bruce, M.A., gave us his admirable treatise on "The Ethics of the Old Testament." "Of monographs on the ethical teaching of our Lord there are not many as yet"; but during 1909 a notable one was published by the Rev. James Stalker, M.A., D.D., entitled "The Ethic of Jesus according to the Synoptic Gospels." This, which was pronounced "one of the three great theological works" of that year, was reviewed at some length in our July issue for 1910. Shortly after Dr. Stalker's book was issued the Ethics of Jesus was brought out by Henry Churchill King, D.D., LL.D., President of Oberlin College. This was very favorably reviewed in our October number. And now what might almost be called a companion book comes to us in the subject of this notice. It is like them, too, in being an essay in a comparatively untried field; for "with the exception of a small volume by Ernesti, entitled *Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus*, published in 1868, and one or two papers in English and German periodicals, there is a singular dearth of writings specially devoted to its theme." It is like them also in being based upon "a careful study of the actual words of the Apostle," although it does not, as Dr. King does, question both the received and the revised text and build only on what are called "the assured results of criticism." Mr. Alexander's book is like them again in being great in quality. Indeed, we venture to predict that as Dr. Stalker's it will rank among "the best three theological works of its year." Nay, we may and should go further. For expository skill and for literary grace we do not know of any recent theological treatise that may be compared with it except the masterly discussion by the Aberdeen professor just referred to.

At this point, however, the resemblance between these two notable volumes ends. Their authors have evidently worked independently, and the results are the more valuable on this account. Mr. Alexander does not follow Dr. Stalker even in the respect in which the latter is most original; viz., in his application to the teaching of our Lord of Aristotle's principle of division, that is, the Supreme Good, Virtue and Duty. On the contrary, Mr. Alexander adopts a principle of his own which seems to us to be not less adequate and suggestive. Thus he distributes his particular topics into three main divisions: "1. *Sources and Postulates*, treating not only of the influences which shaped