

THE
EXPOSITOR.

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A.

THIRD SERIES.

Volume VII.

WITH ETCHING OF REV. PROF. A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D.
BY H. MANESSE.

London :

HODDER AND STOUGHTON,
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

MDCCCLXXXVIII.

[*All rights reserved.*]

RECENT AMERICAN LITERATURE ON THE NEW
TESTAMENT.

AMONG the papers on special passages which have appeared in our magazines, the first mention belongs of right to the delightful paper on "The Disciple whom Jesus Loved," by Dr. Woolsey.¹ With him the quiet years have gathered honey; and whatever he gives us is freighted with the fruits of long meditation. In this paper we scarcely know whether to admire most its careful and exact scholarship, or its tender glow of thoughtfulness. Its fulness defies analysis. Perhaps, however, the kernel is to be found in the discussion of ἀγαπάω and φιλέω, and the application of its results to the passages treated. In general, Dr. Woolsey agrees with Dr. Trench in the distinguishing of the two words, but very justly corrects his application of the distinction in xxi. 15 seq. Dr. Trench supposes that Peter chose φιλέω because ἀγαπάω sounded too cold for his warmth of personal affection. "May we not rather consider it," says Dr. Woolsey, "to be more probable that Peter felt his love to Christ to be too human, too much like a friend's love to a friend, and ventured not on this solemn occasion to give it the name more [*sic*] appropriate to a love such as did not reach the point of ἀγάπη?" Hence it is humility and a feeling of unworthiness which leads Peter to choose another expression; that one which his consciousness and conduct might both justify." Readers of Principal Edwards' interesting paper on "Testament or Covenant?" in the EXPOSITOR, will turn with interest to a careful discussion of the same problem by Dr. F. Gardiner.² He too concludes for "covenant," but takes διαθέμενος to refer to the victim not in a passive, mediative, or substitutive sense, but somewhat pregnantly as that which "makes" the covenant in the sense of "ratifies," or "confirms," as we may say the seal makes the bond. In the same journal, Prof. D. R. Goodwin convincingly argues that "and," in Heb. x. 38, is no part of the quotation, and should be printed accordingly (pp. 84-5). And in

¹ "The Disciple whom Jesus Loved: with some remarks on the passages where these words are used." By Theodore D. Woolsey, D.D., in the *Andover Review*, August, 1885. Pp. 163-185.

² On διαθήκη in Heb. ix. 16, 17, in the *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* for 1885. (Boston: 1886. Pp. 8-19.)

an earlier number Prof. Genung¹ elucidates Rom. x. 4-11. Prof. Wm. G. Ballentine gives us, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for July, 1885, pp. 565-568, a new interpretation of the crux of Gal. iii. 16, the hinge of which is to take "who is Christ" not of the individual person "Christ," but of the collective body, "*Christ and His children*"; and thus see in Paul's understanding of *יִרְעָה*, not one individual, but one body of seed as distinguished from other bodies of seed, *i.e.* Israel according to the promise as distinguished from Israel according to the flesh.

We have crossed the line into the sphere of Biblical Theology when we come to Dr. Stevens' paper on "The Pauline Theology of the Law,"² a very suggestive discussion, although we do not think the author sufficiently feels the *nuances* of Paul's usage of *νόμος* without the article. It will not be necessary to do more than mention the fact that a new edition of Dr. Joseph P. Thompson's *The Theology of Christ*³ has appeared. Place must be found for a similar mere mention of Dr. S. T. Lowrie's translation of Cremer's *Beyond the Grave*,⁴ to which he has prefixed an introduction by Dr. A. A. Hodge, which is more valuable than the original.

By the side of this book must be placed another conceived in a similar spirit—Dr. Wm. H. Furness's "*The Story of the Resurrection of Christ*, with some additional remarks on the character of Christ, and the Historical Claims of the Four Gospels."⁵ He too honours Christ, and believes in the reality of His resurrection, but denies to Him that Deity which give His life and death and resurrection their saving power. Perhaps this thorough apologetic of the resurrection is, however, all the more interesting because of the standpoint of the author.

Among works of a somewhat apologetic character, we may mention Dr. B. Pick's paper on *The Talmud, a Witness to Christ and Christianity*,⁶ in which he gathers a number of passages from the Talmud testifying to the existence of Christianity or of the Christian teaching or books in the early centuries. Here, too, attention should be called to Dr. S. H. Kellogg's⁷ comparison of

¹ *Journal, etc.*, for 1884. (Boston: 1885. Pp. 29-36.)

² *The Baptist Quarterly Review*. (New York: April, 1886. Pp. 189-200.)

³ New York: E. B. Treat. 12mo, pp. xvi., 206.

⁴ New York: Harper & Bros., 1886. 16mo, pp. xxxviii., 153.

⁵ Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co.

⁶ *The Lutheran Church Review*, 1886. Pp. 121-141.

⁷ *The Light of Asia and the Light of the World, etc.* By S. H. Kellogg, D.D. (London: Macmillan & Co., 1885. 8vo, pp. xviii., 390.)

Christianity and Buddhism, in their records, stories, doctrines, and ethics. In the former part of the book the literary relation of the Gospels to Buddhism is carefully examined, and Seydel's book, *Das Evangelium von Jesu in seinem Verhältnissen zu Buddha—Sage und Buddha-Lehre* (1880), is followed step by step to its refutation. Elsewhere it touches in a like apologetic interest on New Testament theology and New Testament ethics.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.
