

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME VI

JANUARY 1908

NUMBER I

JOHN KNOX AS STATESMAN.

It was unfortunate that the recent celebration of the four hundredth anniversary of the birth of John Knox should have taken place in the midst of a discussion as to the accuracy of the hitherto accepted date of that event. There is no longer much room for doubt that the challenge of Dr. Hay Fleming was well founded, and that the Reformer was born, not in 1505, but in 1515, and died at the age of fifty-seven. The commemoration, nevertheless, was highly successful, and revived the impression of Knox's great personality and his unique services. It called forth also some excellent additions to the literature of the subject, among which Professor Cowan's contribution to an American series of admirable monographs on the *Heroes of the Reformation* is one of the best. Mr. Andrew Lang's extraordinary outburst has affected no reputation but his own.

We propose in the present paper to consider Knox in one aspect only—that of statesman. That a man, who was simply parish minister of Edinburgh, and who never but for a few months in an emergency undertook any political function, should nevertheless be classed as a statesman, and one of the most capable and successful statesmen of his time, will seem strange to no one who really knows the history of Scotland during Queen Mary's reign.

With such worthless historical material at hand the writer is properly at liberty to construct a Paul of his own imagining: and it is just here that we are disappointed, for it would have been more to the writer's credit had he created for us something other than the pitiful, weak, illogical, vacillating, shadowy, character who is introduced to us as "The Missionary", "The Mystic", "The Theologian". It is rather too severe a strain upon the imagination of the reader to suppose that such an impossible Paul could have accomplished the work assigned to him in history. For most men it will be more simple to suppose that the author is mistaken and that the Bible contains at least a fair measure of truth.

Princeton.

CHAS. R. ERDMAN.

DER ZEUGNISZWECK DES EVANGELISTEN JOHANNES nach seinen eigenen Angaben dargestellt von LIC. THEOL. KONRAD MEYER. Gütersloh. Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann. 1906. pp. vi., 110.

In seeking to determine the purpose of the Fourth Gospel, Meyer has chosen a fruitful method of investigation, which, though obvious and simple enough, has too often been neglected. Instead of setting out from the contents of the Gospel as a whole, in order to determine from the character of the finished product the purpose that must have inspired its production, he carefully investigates first the direct information that the author gives as to his own plan, in order then to interpret the whole in the light of the information thus secured. This information is contained, Meyer believes, in a series of "specially Johannine" bits, inserted by the author of the whole Gospel at various points in the course of the narrative, which are somewhat different in language and thought from the rest of the Gospel, and with the First Epistle of John display a unity which permits of regarding their testimony as whole. The special insertions are i. 1-18; ii. 21ff.; iii. 16ff.; (vii. 39); xi. 51f.; xii. 37-43; xix. 35-37; xx. 30f. These passages, then, with the important addition of the First Epistle, are regarded by Meyer as forming the source of direct information as to the purpose of the evangelist. "In these passages the author claims to make report as an eye-witness of the life and death of Jesus Christ, for the furtherance of faith." That the author claims to be an eye-witness is proved (1) by the distinction made in Jn. xix. 35 and 1 Jn. i. 3 between the writer and his readers, (2) by the fact that the right of "witnessing" about Christ is in the thought of the evangelist conditioned upon a personal experience of his human life (See especially Jn. xv. 27), (3) by the occurrence of *ἑθεασάμεθα* in Jn. i. 14, which verb in John is used only of literal, bodily sight, (4) by the absolutely unmistakable passage 1 Jn. i. 1-3. Since the writer of the Epistle is clearly identical with the writer of the Gospel, no interpretation of Jn. xix. 35 should be adopted which would separate the eye-witness there mentioned from the evangelist himself; for then one eye-witness would be found to appeal to another. Of course, it might be objected against Meyer that this

would not be quite an impossible proceeding; yet after all, if the evangelist is himself an eye-witness, there is no sufficient reason for finding a second eye-witness in xix. 35. This remains true whether or no Meyer is right in referring the *ἐκεῖνος* of xix. 35 to the glorified Christ. The second main division deals with the subject and occasion of the witnessing. The subject is Jesus "the Christ, the Son of God"; the occasion is the prevalence of false teaching which emanated from Judaism and from docetism. In the Gospel, the former source of error is more prominent; in the Epistle, the latter; but both forms of error are combated in either writing. The Jewish and docetic errors as combated in the Gospel, though not united in the same party, as at the time of the Ignatian epistles, are not so entirely separate as at first sight appears. Between faith in the man Jesus who through the Elias-baptism received the power of the Christ and faith in the man Jesus with whom in the baptism the Christ was united, the difference is formal rather than material; the transition would be a transition from pure Jewish to gnostic ideas (see p. 48). In the case of either form of error, the importance of the baptism is evident; hence the effort of the evangelist to correct an exaggerated idea of the importance of the Baptist may be explained without reference to any distinct sect of disciples of John. The third section describes the carrying out of the witness in the Gospel, under the familiar heads of the witness of the "signs", of Jesus Himself, of the Baptist, of Moses and the Scriptures, and of the Spirit. In the fourth section, which deals with "strengthening of faith as the purpose of the witnessing", the author takes occasion to distinguish his own view sharply from those of Baldensperg, Wrede and Wernle by emphasizing the subordinate character of the apologetic interests in the Gospel as over against the general purpose of witnessing. (See p. 92). The Gospel was intended for Christians; "it may, it is true, be called a writing 'born of the conflict', but it is a proclamation to the general's own camp, not a challenge to the enemy"; though such a proclamation does contain a defiance of the enemy (p. 103). In a short appendix, Meyer expresses the view that Chap. xxi. is a later addition written mainly for the purpose of exhibiting Peter as reinstated in his position of authority. Either the chapter is not to be attributed to the evangelist at all or at least vv. 1-23 were written under widely different circumstances from those which prevailed at the time the Gospel was composed.

In some of the details of his work Meyer has ventured upon very doubtful ground, yet he is suggestive and instructive even where he is not convincing. The progress of the argument is sometimes obscure, but the wealth of fruitful suggestions which the booklet affords will repay careful study. The general conclusion as to the purpose of the evangelist is thoroughly sane and reasonable, but has evidently been attained not by mere appropriation of the results of others but by independent thinking. Meyer has in a modest way made a genuine contribution to the discussion of the Johannine problem.