

# THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME VII

JANUARY 1909

NUMBER I

## JOHN HOWIE OF LOCHGOIN: HIS FOREBEARS AND HIS WORKS.

Throughout Scotland and beyond it, John Howie has been a power for good for more than a century. Strictly speaking, he ought to be described as John Howie *in* Lochgoin, not *of* Lochgoin, as he was merely the tenant, not the owner; but the Howie family have occupied that moor-land farm for so many generations that they are constantly and naturally spoken of as the Howies of Lochgoin; and of the many Johns in that family the author of *The Scots Worthies* is preëminently known as John Howie of Lochgoin.

There is no certainty as to the precise year, not even as to the precise century, in which the Howie's first went to Lochgoin; nor is there any certainty as to the district or country from which they came. The origin of the Howies, indeed, like that of many of the oldest landed Scottish families, is lost in the haze of antiquity.

In one passage, the author of *The Scots Worthies* thus refers to the origin of his family:

"Our house had been very ancient in suffering for religion; (some have said that our first progenitors in this land fled from the French persecution in the 9th century)."<sup>1</sup>

It will be noticed that he does not vouch for the truth of

---

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs*, 1796, p. 153.

The clause, "He declareth unto man what is his thought", of Amos iv. 13, is explained on p. 160 of the thought of man, and quoted to illustrate the divine omniscience; and on p. 200 of God's thought, to illustrate the divine self-communication. On p. 114, Antiochus III should be Artaxerxes III.

A fairly representative list of literature and index of subjects, and index of Scripture passages, are appended.

*Princeton.*

GEERHARDUS VOS.

ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS. The Greek text, with Introduction and Notes by GEORGE MILLIGAN, D.D., Minister of Caputh, Perthshire. Macmillan & Co., Limited, St. Martin's Street, London (The Macmillan Company, New York). 1908. Pp. cix, 195. \$2.60 net.

Up to the closing years of the nineteenth century, the Greek language of the New Testament period was studied almost exclusively in literary sources. Within the past fifteen years, however, the rubbish-heaps and mummy-cases of Egypt have yielded a great mass of private documents of all sorts, such as receipts, petitions, contracts, and private letters, which furnish excellent material for a study of the language of everyday life. Increased attention has also been devoted to the inscriptions, which, unlike the papyri, are found not in Egypt alone, but in all parts of the Greek world. These new materials have not been allowed to remain unused; they have been made accessible by many carefully-edited series of publications; and the lexicographers and grammarians have already begun to study their significance for linguistic science. Moreover, Deissman, J. H. Moulton and others have addressed themselves to the special task of showing the significance of the new discoveries for the study of the language of the New Testament. But Milligan is the first to make systematic use of the new materials in the exegesis of a continuous portion of the New Testament, and therein consists the chief significance of the commentary now before us.

The index on pp. 183-191, containing a list of the numerous publications of inscriptions and papyri that have been used, with the passages cited, will itself convey some impression of the diligence that the author has devoted to his task, and this impression is confirmed by a detailed study of the commentary. By the frequent references to papyri and inscriptions—at least three or four almost on every page—Milligan's commentary becomes at any rate something quite new; it is materially different from any exegetical work that has preceded it. But the author's study of the papyri and inscriptions has by no means made him neglectful of other material for illustration. Parallels from Greek literature are not ignored, and especially the Old Testament and later Jewish writings are estimated at their true worth as aids to the exegesis of the epistles. In general, the moderation with which Milligan applies the new methods to the linguistic study of the New Testament is worthy

of emulation. Though fully appreciative of the linguistic affinity existing between the New Testament on the one side and the papyri as representatives of the common spoken language of the Greek world on the other, Milligan does not feel it necessary to drive every "Hebraism" relentlessly from the field. In adopting the new methods, he has not discarded the old.

What then is the result of this diligent and judicious employment of the papyri and inscriptions as aids to the exegesis of two of the Pauline epistles? In the first place, the labor is not wasted, even if it leads, in a narrow sense, to failure; for it was necessary as an experiment. If Milligan has done nothing more than demonstrate by his honest effort the uselessness of the papyrus finds for New Testament exegesis, he has performed a useful service in clearing the way for future commentators. The new materials were of a kind at least to demand attention; a serious attempt at using them had to be made before New Testament exegetes could with anything like a good conscience continue to proceed along the old lines. As a matter of fact, however, the value of Milligan's work is not merely the value that belongs to an unsuccessful experiment. It is true that the papyri and inscriptions, as cited in the commentary, do not often solve definite exegetical problems. Whether *ἐν βάρει εἶναι* in I Thess. ii:7 (6) means "to be burdensome" or "to be in honor", whether *εἰς τέλος* in I Thess. ii:16 means "to the end" or "to the uttermost", whether *τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σκεῦος* in I Thess. iv:4 means "his own body" or "his own wife", whether *ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου* in II Thess. i:9 means "separated from the presence of the Lord" or "by reason of the presence of the Lord"—these questions are just about as difficult to answer as they ever were. Grammatical or lexical usages, interesting for the exegesis of the epistles, are only very seldom discovered in the papyri or inscriptions alone, unconfirmed by the sources that were available before. Such at least is the general impression that results from the parallels adduced in the commentary now under examination. But the function of the commentator does not consist merely in solving a disconnected series of exegetical problems—he must also seek to reproduce and revivify as a whole in the minds of modern readers the thought of the ancient writing as it existed in the minds of the author and of those who were its first readers. It is chiefly in this less tangible but no less important task that the student of the New Testament may derive assistance from the papyri. They help him perhaps not so much in the details as in the general spirit of his work. They reproduce for him the everyday language of the Greek world of Paul's time, so that it becomes to a certain extent again a living language. By familiarizing himself with the forms of expression employed by the plain people of that day in their ordinary business and private affairs, he is made better able to listen to the epistles of Paul with the ears of those to whom they were originally addressed. Such is perhaps the chief value of the numerous citations in Milligan's commentary. Many of them contain only what was to some extent attested by the literary sources already available; many

of them will perhaps be dispensed with in future commentaries after they have come to be matter of course; but, as showing the special affinity of the New Testament language with the living, spoken language of the time, and as preparing the way for a more general knowledge of that colloquial language as a background for New Testament study, the citations collected by Milligan from the papyri and inscriptions could not have been curtailed without serious loss.

The abundant employment of the new materials for linguistic study does not, however, exhaust the value of Milligan's commentary, which is in general a useful contribution to the investigation of the Thessalonian Epistles. Milligan defends the authenticity and integrity of both epistles, devoting his attention, of course, chiefly to the defense of II Thessalonians (pp. lxxvi-xcii). To explain the remarkable similarity existing between the two epistles, which, especially since the appearance of Wrede's monograph in 1903, has been made the chief basis for the attack upon the genuineness of II Thessalonians, Milligan suggests (p. lvi, n.<sup>3</sup>) that "the words and phrases which, during that anxious time of waiting for the return of Timothy, he [Paul] had been turning over in his mind as the most suitable to address to his beloved Thessalonians", would naturally "have remained in his memory, and have risen almost unconsciously to his lips, as he dictated his second letter to the same Church so shortly afterwards." Less satisfactory is Milligan's appeal to the relation existing between Ephesians and Colossians, for in the first place those who reject II Thessalonians are very apt to reject Ephesians also; and in the second place similarity in linguistic detail between two epistles addressed to different churches at the same time is less surprising than such similarity in two epistles addressed to the same church at different times. To the objection derived from the supposed inconsistency of II Thessalonians with I Thessalonians in the view held of the nearness of the Parousia, Milligan replies that Paul's ideas on that point were in a state of flux. Here Milligan would have done better to abide by his more cautious form of statement that Paul emphasized different aspects of the Parousia at different times. The important argument for the genuineness of the epistle, that is derived from the difficulties involved in rival theories as to its origin, has not been developed with sufficient thoroughness, though what Milligan says is true enough.

The accounts of the city of Thessalonica and of Paul's relations to the Thessalonian Church are interesting and instructive. To overcome the apparent contradiction between I Thessalonians and Acts with regard to the movements of Timothy, Milligan suggests that Silas and Timothy joined Paul in Athens, that when Timothy was sent back to Thessalonica (I Thess. iii. 1) Silas was sent on some other mission, perhaps to Philippi, and that finally both Silas and Timothy rejoined Paul again at Corinth (Acts xviii:5)—a very natural hypothesis. From Paul's recapitulation of his labors in Thessalonica (I Thess. ii:1 ff.), Milligan infers that insinuations against the Apostle had been made in Thessalonica in his absence, and traces these insinuations to a Jewish

source. Here our author differs with Schmiedel, who makes the opponents Gentiles, and with Bornemann, who infers no such special attacks whatever.

The brief section on the general character and contents of the epistles produces a more effective picture both of the writer and of the recipients than does the intolerable diffuseness of Borneman. Milligan accepts only with a caution Deissmann's overdrawn distinction between "letter" and "epistle." The Pauline Epistles, though "letters", require a new category—they are religious letters. The section on language, style and literary affinities is remarkable for its insistence upon the resemblances (conveniently collected in parallel columns) between the Thessalonian Epistles and certain words of Jesus. These resemblances, Milligan believes, are "sufficient to show that St. Paul must have been well acquainted with the actual words of Jesus, and in all probability had actually some written collection of them in his possession". The vocabulary of the epistles, confirmed by the style, conveys to Milligan the impression that "St. Paul, when not directly indebted to the Greek O. T., was mainly dependent upon the living, spoken tongue of his own day." Whether, as Milligan supposes, he also borrowed "from time to time more or less consciously from ethical writers", is more doubtful. In the section on doctrine the comparatively scanty doctrinal content of the epistles is explained rather by the circumstances of the persons addressed than by immaturity in Paul's own thinking. After all, the Apostle had already been engaged for fifteen years in active missionary work, and, we may add, already had behind him the discussions of the Apostolic Council. There had been time enough and occasion enough for the development of the essentials of his system of doctrine. Furthermore, Milligan's exposition is an excellent preventive of underestimating the doctrinal element in the Thessalonian Epistles. Especially the exalted place occupied by the Person of Christ, even in these earliest extant epistles of Paul, is worthy of notice (cf. Additional Note D, The Divine Names in the Epistles).

Of the "additional notes", five are lexical (including the one just mentioned on the Divine Names); among the others the admirable note on "St. Paul as a Letter-Writer," deserves special mention. The private letters among the papyri are made to throw light upon the outward form and general structure of the epistles of Paul. The suggestion, however, that in the case of some of the Pauline epistles the scribe may perhaps have been allowed a certain discretion in throwing the letter into "more formal and complete shape", though it is attractive from some points of view, will probably be felt to encounter serious difficulties. The note on the question whether Paul used the epistolary plural arrives at what is probably the correct conclusion, that Paul's use of the plural can be reduced to no hard and fast rule. But even if Milligan is right in supposing that the regular use of the first person plural in the Thessalonian Epistles indicates a closer joint authorship than was the case in I Corinthians, Galatians, etc., it is yet surprising that he speaks repeatedly of the "writers" of the epistles. Paul may

have written in the name of Silas and Timothy, he may have had them constantly in mind during the composition of the epistles, yet even so he alone can be called the "writer".

The commentary itself, valuable as it is, is not free from serious faults. Milligan has apparently undertaken too little independent investigation of the textual questions. What is more serious, he has occasionally manifested an inability to disengage fundamental exegetical problems from what is merely accidental in the discussions of them. The worst instance of this fault is the note on the difficult phrase τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σκεῦος κτᾶσθαι in I Thess. iv:4. σκεῦος is here usually taken to refer to "his own wife". But Milligan, adopting the alternative view, takes σκεῦος in the sense of "body". Against this interpretation, perhaps the chief objection is that if it be adopted κτᾶσθαι must apparently mean "possess". But no instance of the present tense of κτᾶσθαι used in the sense of "possess" has hitherto been found. The present tense means "to acquire"; it is the perfect tense that means "to possess". The present tense denotes an act; the perfect tense denotes the state resultant upon that act. "But", says Milligan, "to judge from the papyri it would seem as if at least in the popular language this meaning ['possess'] was no longer confined to the perf. (κέκτησθαι)." In proof of this, Milligan cites P. Tebt. 5, 241 ff., where κτᾶσθαι is by Milligan himself, following the editors, translated not "possess" but "take possession of"—really the opposite meaning to the one desired, for "take possession of", like "acquire", denotes an act of which "possess" denotes the resultant state, and therefore represents merely the common use of the present tense. (The other passage cited, P. Oxy. 259, 6, where the future is used, is no clear case in point, for it is hard to see why the meaning "acquire" or "obtain" will not fit the passage.) To make the confusion still worse Milligan finally says, "There seems no reason therefore why κτᾶσθαι should not be used in the passage before us of a man's so 'possessing' or 'taking possession of his body, as to use it in the fittest way for God's service in thorough keeping with the general Pauline teaching". Here the alternative renderings, "take possession of" and "possess", about which the entire discussion ought to have turned, seem finally to be taken as synonyms! Or if the word "possess" is to be understood in its less common sense of "seize", so that it is really equivalent to "take possession of", then it was an incorrect translation of κέκτησθαι. Of course the rendering "take possession of his own body" is linguistically possible. But the reader has no very clear conception of the reasons for its adoption. And the chief objection to it, namely that μὴ ἐν πάθει ἐπιθυμίας in v. 5 would become meaningless—is not even mentioned (cf. Lightfoot, Notes on Epistles of St. Paul, pp. 53ff.).

Milligan's discussion of the eschatological passage, II Thess. ii:1-12, is not particularly elaborate. He advocates the common view that τὸ κατέχον is the civil power, especially as embodied in the Roman state, the "man of lawlessness" being simply brought into connection with the Jewish doctrine of Antichrist, and the "temple of God" being

identified with the temple at Jerusalem. Any criticism of this view is here, of course, impossible. Milligan's historical review of the exegesis of the passage (Note J) is brief; but greater detail would have been useless repetition of what other commentators have done. More to be regretted is the rapidity with which Milligan passes over the deeper implications of the phrases *ὡς δι' ἡμῶν* in II Thess. ii. 2, and *εἶτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς ἡμῶν* in II Thess. ii. 15, and of the clause *ὃ ἐστὶν σημεῖον ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ* in II Thess. ii. 17. For an advocate as well as for an opponent of the genuineness of II Thessalonians, Wrede (*Die Echtheit des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefs*, pp. 62ff.) deserves careful attention when he insists that the *ὡς δι' ἡμῶν* does not necessarily imply doubt on the writer's part of the genuineness of the epistle referred to, any more than Paul in I Cor. vii. 25 means to imply that he had not received mercy from the Lord when he writes *γνώμην δίδωμι ὡς ἡλεημένος ὑπὸ κυρίου πιστὸς εἶναι*. The passage may on this view be paraphrased (see Wrede, *op. cit.*, p. 63): "Do not allow it to disturb you that they are appealing to my word or letter on the ground that this word or letter came from me."

In a number of places, Milligan seems to use the term "*Κοινή*" in a sense that excludes the New Testament. This would only introduce confusion into the terminology. "*Κοινή*" should be used in a broad sense to include "the entire written and spoken development of the Greek language" (E. Schweizer) from about 300 B. C. to about 500 A. D. Milligan's use of the term "Judaistic writings" to designate the Jewish writings enumerated on pp. 188-190, is also open to criticism. "Judaistic" more properly designates a tendency in the Christian Church.

Though the commentary of Milligan can hardly be classed among the really great exegetical works, its employment of new illustrative material and its wealth in instructive lexical studies make it indispensable for every earnest student of the Thessalonian Epistles.

Princeton.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN.

THE SELF-INTERPRETATION OF JESUS CHRIST. A study of the Messianic Consciousness as reflected in the Synoptics. By Rev. G. S. STREATFIELD, M.A., Rector of Fenny Compton. New York: Eaton & Mains; Cincinnati: Jennings & Graham. (London: Hodder & Stoughton). n. d. Crown, 8vo. Pp. xv, 211. Price, \$1.25 net.

The point of departure of Mr. Streatfield's discussion is the language of self-assertion or of self-exaltation which is placed on the lips of Jesus in the narrative of the Gospels. His immediate aim is to vindicate this language to Jesus, or as he himself expresses it, "to support" or "to confirm", "the belief, almost unquestioned until the nineteenth century," that this language "is substantially the language of Jesus Himself" (pp. vi: 4). His ultimate end is, on the basis of this language of self-assertion or of self-exaltation, "to place once more in the full-light the great alternative that Jesus Christ was either truly Di-