



The Princeton Theological Review

APRIL, 1915

THE CONTINUITY OF THE KYRIOS-TITLE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

In one sense or another the title *Kyrios* is applied to Christ throughout the New Testament. It occurs in all the documents with the exception of the Epistle to Titus.¹ And this literary phenomenon means to be expressive of a true historical continuity. It claims to exist not merely in the minds of the various writers, but to reflect the actual usage of the successive periods of our Lord's life and of New Testament history. It has been commonly assumed that this claim is in accord with the facts, that from the beginning onward and uninterruptedly ever after Jesus called Himself or was called *Kyrios*. Besides this it has also been commonly believed that the continuity observable was more than a mere chronological one. The usage in the days of our Lord's flesh was taken to have prepared the way for the usage in the mother-church after the resurrection, and this again to have given rise to the Pauline usage. An unbroken line of development according to the generally accepted view connects the earliest with the latest use made of the title within the New Testament period.

Bousset in his recent book entitled *Kyrios Christos* calls this continuity in question.² Though not the first one to take this view,³ Bousset for the first time has made the

¹ Its absence here seems to be due to the pointed preference for *Soter* as a title of Christ, i. 4; ii. 13; iii. 6.

² Cp. the notice of Bousset's book in this *Review*, 1914 (xii), pp. 636-645.

³ Predecessors of Bousset in this assumption were Heitmüller, *Zum Problem Paulus und Jesus* in ZNTW, 1912 (xiii), pp. 320-327, and Böhlig, *Zum Begriff Kyrios bei Paulus* in ZNTW, 1913 (xiv), pp. 23-37; cp. also the review of Bousset's work by Brückner in *Theol. Rundschau*, 1914 (xvii), pp. 169-182.

been immensely instructed indeed, but not convinced. We are willing enough to believe that the so-called "Neutral" text is Egyptian in its provenience. But we are unwilling to believe that it rests on Origen rather than Origen on it; or that it rests on the Syrian text rather than the Syrian text, in part, on it. We should be helped in our estimate of Dr. Hoskier's argument if he had told us plainly somewhere or other what he thinks of and is prepared to do with the "Western" text. That it is "profoundly ancient and important" everybody understands. Does it contain the whole valuable base of the "Syrian" text? Is there an element common to the so-called "Syrian" and Mr. Hoskier's "Egyptian" text, not found in the "Western" documents, which is original? Is there an element in the "Western" documents not found in either the "Syrian" or the "Egyptian" text which is original? We have not been able on a cursory reading of the book to make out clearly the broad answers which Mr. Hoskier would give to such questions. Where is that "base" which Mr. Hoskier recognizes as older than either the "Antioch" or the "Alexandria" groups to be found?

We have not been able to persuade ourselves, under Mr. Hoskier's guidance, that the Gospel of Mark was written originally in Latin as well as in Greek and that our Greek text has been affected by a Greek translation of the original Latin,—anymore than we were able to persuade ourselves, under Blass' guidance, that it was written originally in Aramaic and was circulated in two Greek translations from it. Here is a place where it is worth while to look at Mark itself and not at its scribes. It is clear enough that Mark is an original Greek book.

In one thing we feel in very complete accord with Mr. Hoskier. We refer to his attitude towards what is now commonly spoken of as "Modernism." We agree with him that what Mr. Robinson Smith, for instance has to say of the Gospels and what Dean Inge for instance has said of Paul in the writings cited is "unfortunate."

Princeton.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

Die Apostelgeschichte. Von der 5. Auflage neu bearbeitet von D. HANS HINRICH WENDT, o. Professor in Jena. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913. Pp. iv 370. Mk. 8 geb. ca. 9.40. (Kritisch-exegetische Kommentar über das Neue Testament begründet von Heinr. Aug. Wihl. Meyer. Dritte Abteilung—9 Auflage.)

Since 1899, there have been many important developments in the study of Acts; the present edition of Wendt's well-known work is therefore to be greeted with satisfaction. Wendt has in general made abundant use of the recent literature though the total ignoring of the most elaborate and perhaps the most valuable of recent commentaries—that of Knowling in the *Expositor's Greek Testament*—constitutes a very serious defect.

The commentary of Wendt is characterized especially by an admirable clearness; the author is at all times in full mastery of his material;

it is very seldom that so learned a work is at the same time so refreshingly easy to use. The method of the commentary is entirely different from that of Meyer; unlike the founder of the undertaking of which the present work forms a part, Wendt is rather sparing in his citation of diverging exegetical opinions, though such citations appear when they are really necessary, and though the author's own view is defended against serious objections. The book is thus kept within reasonable bounds. Yet conciseness never degenerates into obscurity, and the treatment of exegetical difficulties, though brief, is seldom inadequate. In method and in form, this commentary provides an admirable model.

With regard to historical questions, the commentator is pretty clearly naturalistic in his point of view; the miraculous elements in the narrative of Acts are regarded as legendary. Both historical criticism and literary criticism, however, are applied, on the whole, as moderately as is to be expected on the basis of naturalistic presuppositions. The return of Harnack to traditional views as to authorship and date, finds, it is true, no favor with Wendt; the Book of Acts, according to our commentator, was written about A.D. 100 by a man of the post-apostolic age; the post-apostolic point of view is thought to be revealed by important misconceptions on the part of the author with regard to the early history of the Church. On the other hand, however, Wendt rejects altogether the Tübingen conception of the purpose of the book; the chief purpose he believes to be simply historical—the purpose of narrating the facts—though this purpose was supplemented by a disturbing endeavor to make history subservient to edification. The supposed historical defects of the book are thus attributed, not, as the Tübingen scholars believed, to intentional misrepresentation, but to the necessary limitations of an author who lived at a time when the unedifying conflicts of the apostolic age had been largely smoothed away from the memory of the Church; the author presented the facts honestly as he saw them, but he saw them under the presuppositions of his own time.

The treatment of the knotty problem of sources affords abundant scope for Wendt's gift of lucid exposition; with wise elimination of minutiae, the chief generic views are briefly characterized and the author's own solution is clearly presented. Wendt believes that only one source can be clearly distinguished in the Book of Acts, though other sources may well have been used. This source, according to Wendt, embraces the so-called "we-sections" of the book; it was written by a companion of Paul and in all probability by Luke. It is by no means to be limited, however, to the we-sections themselves; these sections are indissolubly connected with their context; the Lucan source embraces not merely the bulk of the narrative from Chapter xiii on, but also the account of Stephen which lies at the base of Chapters vi and vii, and the account of the founding of the Antioch church in xi. 19ff. Of course this Lucan source is

not thought to have been reproduced exactly by the author of the book; on the contrary Wendt thinks it was not only made to conform to the author's own style, but was also supplemented and expanded at many points.

The means by which the Lucan source can be separated from the rest of the book is, according to Wendt, to be found not in any linguistic criteria—for the author has impressed his own style upon the whole—nor chiefly in the higher degree of historical probability which is to be detected in the work of the eye-witness as compared with the other portions of the narrative, but rather in the roughnesses caused by the joining of the source to narratives really contradictory to it. It may be said at this point that such a method of analysis has very uncertain results. The really important difficulty, however, that faces any separation of a Lucan source from elements added by the final author is simply the presence of the first person plural in the narrative; and it cannot be said that Wendt has overcome the difficulty. Why did the final author permit the first person plural of the source to remain? He might conceivably have done so if he had been a mere compiler, if he had reproduced the source in a purely mechanical way. But as a matter of fact he was not a mere compiler; Wendt is in substantial agreement with Harnack as to the literary unity of the book. Why did so skillful a writer remove every peculiarity of the source except the one which most needed removal (compare Harnack, *Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte*, p. 11); why did a writer of the post-apostolic age leave in his work the nonsense of a first person plural in a narrative of events with which he was not personally connected? The only light which Wendt seems to be able to shed upon this question is that the first person plural had impressed itself firmly upon the author's memory and that perhaps he purposely retained this feature of the source just in order to show that he was using the narrative of an eye-witness. This latter suggestion is surely very unsatisfactory; a clumsier way for a post-apostolic writer to call attention to an apostolic source could scarcely be imagined; if the author had any definite purpose in retaining the "we", it could only be that of designing himself (falsely) as an eye-witness, and that he had this purpose Wendt is very properly unable to believe. The truth is, the only natural explanation of the first person plural in the Book of Acts is the old explanation that the author was himself a companion of Paul. The author introduces himself in Acts i. 1 in a thoroughly personal way; Theophilus knew exactly who he was; when therefore in Acts xvi. 10 he suddenly drops into the use of the first person, there could be no reasonable doubt as to what he meant—he meant simply that at Troas he himself had joined the Pauline company and was therefore an eye-witness of the events that followed. The use of the "we" is the most natural thing in the world if the author of the "we-sections" was also the author

of the whole book; on any other hypothesis it presents a literary problem which neither Wendt nor anyone else has succeeded in solving.

With regard to the much discussed question of the Apostolic Council Wendt arrives at very conservative results. The author is thought to have elaborated, in accordance with his own ideas, the information which he had received, but that information itself is rated high; the apostolic decree (Acts xv. 28, 29), in particular, Wendt believes to have been adopted at the time where it is placed by the author of Acts, and essentially in the form in which it appears in the \aleph B text. The error of the author is practically reduced to the assignment by him of a wider scope to the decree than it really had. Wendt has here performed a useful service in the defence of the Book of Acts; and those who accept the Lucan authorship will not find much difficulty in removing the objection that Wendt still allows to stand; it may easily be shown that the author of Acts by no means necessarily implies the imposition of the decree by Paul generally upon Gentile converts. In defending the essential historicity of the decree, an opponent of the Lucan authorship of the book has here refuted admirably what has been regarded as a decisive argument against the traditional view.

Space would fail us to give even any fair sample of the contribution made by this notable commentary to the interpretation of the Book of Acts; every page of the work is worthy of the most careful attention; the author deserves the gratitude of every earnest student. Such gratitude, however, should not be allowed to obscure the momentous issues involved. There are only two really distinct views about the origin of Christianity. The one makes Christianity a product of the creative activity of the transcendent God, an entrance into the world of a new saving power, unlike the ordinary activities of God's providence; the other makes it a product of such forces—call them divine or not as you please—as were already here. The one is the view of the New Testament; the other is the view of modern naturalism. There is no real middle ground; the choice must be made. And Wendt, it is to be feared, has chosen; his confidence in the Lucan history concerns details; the essential message of the Book of Acts is apparently by him rejected.

Princeton.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN.

Kritische Analyse der Apostelgeschichte. Von JULIUS WELLHAUSEN. Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse. Neue Folge. Band xv. No. 2. Berlin. Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 1914. pp. 56.

The literary unity of Acts is well established. The author certainly made use of sources of information other than his own experience, and some of these may have been written sources; but it is difficult to determine the character and extent of the written sources by the