NOTES ON RECENT NEW TESTAMENT STUDY.

In the *Journal* of the American Oriental Society (vol. xxvi. 1906, pp. 317 f.), Prof. G. F. Moore discusses Matthew xxiii. 35 f. and xxviii. 1 in the light of the Talmud. In opposition to Wellhausen (so Nestle, in *Zeitschrift für d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1905, 198 f.), he regards the Zechariah of the former passage as very probably the son of Jehoiada. His "death and its bloody expiation were the subject of a legend whose popularity is attested by the frequency with which it is repeated in Jewish sources; in this literature it is, in fact, the typical murder of a prophet." Though the literature in question is much later than the New Testament, the legend, a Midrash on 2 Chronicles xxiv. 19–25, may well be older than the Christian era. The last words of the dying prophet were, "Yahwè, see and require it," and the judgment of God on Jerusalem showed how the prophet's blood was required at the hands of the Jews. Like Abel's, his blood cried from the ground for vengeance. The Lucan phrase, *the blood of Zechariah*, probably was expanded by a later editor or scribe into the Matthean form which adds *son of Barachias*, thereby confusing the Old Testament prophet with the hero of the Midrash.

Schmiedel's discovery of a discrepancy of half a day between Matthew xxviii. 1 and Mark xvi. 1–2 (*Encyclop. Biblica*, iv. 4041 f.) is rejected, on the ground that the words ὀψὲ δὲ σαββάτων τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων are the literal rendering of a Hebrew or Aramaic source in which במוצאי שבת (Heb.) or באפוקי שבתא (Aram.) had their usual idiomatic sense of a time after the end of the Sabbath, sometimes Saturday night in general or even the whole of Sunday (i.e. = ὀψὲ δὲ σαββάτων). The second part

of the Greek phrase also goes back to the Jewish idiom, נבהי or אור designating "the night whose morning would bring in the following day." Thus, when the Greek words are taken as reproducing literally Jewish divisions of time, any discrepancy between Matthew and the other Gospels on this point vanishes. All state that the women went to the tomb by night.

In his large volume, *der Paulinismus u. die Logia Jesu in ihrem gegenzeitigen Verhältniss untersucht* (1904), Resch attempts, amid other things, to show that Paul's use of the Logia is proved by the dependence of 1 Corinthians vii. 10–11 on Mark x. 11, and of 1 Thessalonians iv. 15 f. ("this I say unto you by a word of the Lord," etc.) on Mark xiii. 26–27. Professor Kirsopp Lake, in the *American Journal of Theology* (Jan. 1906, pp. 107 f.), examines both of these instances, only to find that they break down as proof of the alleged relationship, though they suggest the Apostle's use of some smaller and less formal collection of sayings (so Heinrici). In 1 Corinthians vii. 10 f. Paul introduces his decision with the words *παραγγέλλω οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀλλὰ ὁ κύριος* (contrast 6 and 25), and the only extant evangelic logion which discusses the divorce or desertion of a husband by a wife is preserved in Mark x. 10–12, where Resch adopts the teaching of Codex Bezae, *ἐὰν γυνὴ ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλον μοιχᾶται.* Furthermore, "*Syr. Sin.* and *Farn.* 1 place the case of the wife before that of the husband, just as Paul does." In 1 Thessalonians iv. 15 f., though the characteristic features of Mark xiii. 26 f. are too different to make it a probable source, yet some collection of *λόγοι* may be quoted from. "I think it more likely that Mark xiii. 20 f. is in itself an early attempt to expound some genuine saying, perhaps the same as that implied in 1 Thessalonians iv. 15, by an exegesis, inspired by Jewish

apocalyptic literature, parts of which are imbedded in the present text." This accords with the view of Oscar Holtzmann (*Life of Jesus*, E. Tr. pp. 9–10), who thinks it extremely probable that Jesus spoke of "the resuscitation of his friends, in some such words as those of 1 Thessalonians iv. 16 f."

Wrede's pamphlet against the Pauline authorship of 2 Thessalonians (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, ix. 2) is the subject of a somewhat belated review by Wernle in the *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* (1905, pp. 347–352). The collection of parallel matter which, it is urged by Wrede, render impossible the composition of 2 Thessalonians by the author of 1 Thessalonians, are sifted and scrutinized carefully by the reviewer. Thus II. iii. 8=I. ii. 9 loses much of its force when we recollect that ἐν κόπῳ καὶ μόχθῳ is a common expression of Paul himself (2 Cor. xi. 37), as is νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐργάζεσθαι. The coincidence between II. ii. 1 and I. v. 12 proves little or nothing, since the content of ἐρωτῶμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀδελφοί is different, while ἐρωτᾷν itself (cf. Phil. iv. 3, etc.) is frequently employed in exhortation. The parallel between II. i. 4 and I. i. 3 is discounted by the fact that ὑπομονή stands in a different construction and connexion in these passages, and, upon the whole, the case against the authenticity cannot be said to have been proved on the mere question of the literary relationship between the two epistles (p. 349). Proceeding to discuss Wrede's reconstruction of the situation presupposed by the epistle, Wernle protests that insufficient account is taken in many quarters of the difference between pseudonymous epistles being written to individuals (e.g. the Pastorals) and similar epistles to churches—the latter procedure involving difficulties which are too frequently ignored by historical critics. The definite argument in favour of a later date are one by one

weighed and found wanting in cogency. In short, while the authenticity of the Epistle cannot be said to be proved, everything becomes clear and intelligible "if 2 Thessalonians was actually written not long after 1 Thessalonians, forty or fifty years later, it is an enigma." Wernle thus comes into line, at this point, with Clemen, who also accepts, in his life of Paul (i. p. 139), the Epistle as authentic.

In a recent essay in the *Studien und Kritiken* (1905, iv. pp. 521–565), Dr. Wilhelm Soltau has developed afresh the older theory of H. J. Holtzmann upon the literary relations between Ephesians and Colossians. It is not enough, he sees, to regard the former Epistle as a sub-Pauline variation upon Colossians, nor can the latter Epistle, even on the hypothesis that Paul wrote it, be accepted as extant in its original form. Professor Soltau detects two classes of interpolation in Colossians, one series being due to the more or less accidental intrusion of glosses from the margin into the text, the other proceeding from the pen of a transcriber who introduced a number of passages from Ephesians. Thus, while the original "Colossians" (Col. A) consisted substantially of i. 1–13, ii. 1–7, 8–19, ii. 20–iii. 4, iv. 10–18, our canonical "Ephesians" is based upon the original Epistle to the Laodiceans, which is to be found practically in Col. B = Colossians i. 21–29 (cf. 1 Pet. i. 5–9 f., Eph. iv. 18, ii. 16), iii. 5–11, 12–17, 18–iv. 4, iv. 7–10. This latter Epistle was drawn upon by the writer who interpolated the original "Colossians" into its canonical form, and it also afforded a subsequent Paulinist of the second century a nucleus for composing our canonical "Ephesians." This theory, it is claimed, accounts satisfactorily for the disappearance of the Epistle to Laodicea, since, like the Logia of Matthew, once incorporated in a larger writing, it would no longer possess the same *raison d'être*. The object of the

original "Colossians" letter (i.e. minus i. 6, 9, 10*b*, 11*a*, 14–20, 28, ii. 2*a*, 9, 13, 15, 19, all interpolations from "Ephesians"; together with insertions in i. 12*b*, 24*b*, 25*a*, ii. 7*a*, 11*b*, 22–23) is to refute Philonic influences, as in Philonism the angel cult and legalism were combined. Philonism is the *philosophy* of Colossians ii. 8 (pp. 539 f.), and the polemic is directed against the contemporary Alexandrian philosophy of Judaism.

These Epistles are edited, on much less radical lines, by Paul Ewald in Zahn's *Commentary* (vol. x., 1905), who decides for Rome as the place of their composition (pp. 2–7). In Ephesians i. 1, for the obscure *τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν . . . καὶ πιστοῖς*, Dr. Ewald still proposes, as he did formerly (*Neue Kirch. Zeitschrift*, 1904, pp. 560 f.), to read *τοῖς ἀγαπητοῖς ὦσιν . . . κ. π.* The origin of the words *in Ephesus* is ascribed to the fact that the Epistle originally was in the possession of that church. As a general circular epistle, designed for Laodicea and the Asiatic churches (pp. 17 f.), it naturally would be specially connected with the leading city and church of the province. Ephesians he is inclined to date prior to Colossians (pp. 20–25).

Bachmann's edition of the first Corinthian Epistle, in the same series (vol. vii. 1905), discusses its date in an appendix (pp. 480 f.), which controverts the usual idea that the Epistle was written *towards the close* of Paul's three years at Ephesus (xvi. 8). The opening for fresh work, it is held, must have led to more than a couple of months' residence, and the *ἐθηριομάχησα* of xv. 32 (cf. xvi. 9) shows that Paul is looking back on the first, and not on the second, part of his story at Ephesus (Acts xix. 9–20). It is in the vicinity of the period described in Acts xix. 9 f., that is, during the spring of 56 A.D., that the Epistle was composed; cf. *the*

many adversaries with verse 9, the *fighting with beasts* with verse 19, the *open door* with verse 11 f. The two most recent English editors of the Epistle also placed it in the spring either of 55 (so Mr. Goudge, in the *Westminster Commentaries*), or of 56 (so Professor Findlay, in the *Expositor's Greek Testament*).

The most recent edition of the Catholic Epistles, by the Roman Catholic scholar, Th. Calmes (Paris, 1905, pp. 242), adds little or nothing to previous editions constructed upon the most rigid traditional lines. But an ingenious hypothesis with regard to 2 Peter has been promulgated by another scholar of the same communion. Attempts have been often made, from Grotius to Kühl, to find interpolated matter in 2 Peter, but P. Ladeuze, of Louvain, in a recent study (*Revue Biblique*, 1905, pp. 543–552), while refusing to regard ii. 1–iii. 2 as an interpolation from Jude (Kühl) or to separate chapters ii. and iii., proposes the novel idea that iii. 1–16 ought to be immediately after ii. 3*a*, in order to avoid certain roughnesses and dislocations in the canonical form of the text. In the latter, it is held, ii 1–3*a* announce prophetically the appearance of ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι among the faithful, whereas 3*b* assumes their presence at the moment. Similarly iii. 1–3 refer to the future, and when they are set side by side with ii. 1–3*a*, the passage from the future to the present (iii. 4 f.) becomes less violent, the author writing, in prophetic fashion, of a present crisis. The opening of the Epistle thus (i. 5 f.) contains a positive exhortation to the Christian life, in view of the imminent advent (iii. 11–15). Then comes the negative section (iii. 16, ii. 3*b*–22), warning the faithful against the seductions and doom of errorists. In this way, Ladeuze argues, the connexion between ii. 3*a* and iii. 1 is preserved (the writer aiming to correct and meet the seductive arguments of the errorists), ii. 3*b* fits in with

iii. 16 (*οἷς τὸ κρῖμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ, καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν νυστάζει* following *ἃ οἱ ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ἀστήρικτοι στρεβλοῦσιν . . . πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν*), and iii. 17 forms the natural conclusion of ii. 20–22. Thus, too, the author is acquitted of having gone off into the long digression of chapter ii., forgetting the primary question of the Advent with which he had started. The transposition must have been accidental, due perhaps to some copyist who was interrupted at ii. 3*a*, and, on resuming his work, inadvertently began with ii. 3*b*. Whereupon, discovering his mistake, he simply added the omitted passage at the end, calling attention to the error by a note or mark on the margin, which afterwards was lost sight of. This implies that the archetype was in roll form. If it was in cover form, the transposition of a leaf would be equally simple, and in a palimpsest of the eighth or ninth century, Ladeuze points out, ii. 3*b*–22 occupies seventy-five lines, while iii. 1–16 is almost equal to it (seventy-two lines).

The Domitianic date of the Apocalypse receives fresh corroboration from the researches of Herr Linsenmayer on *Die Bekämpfung des Christentums durch den römischen Staat bis zum Tode des Kaisers Julian* (1905). The Munich scholar, like Görres, shows how the general friendliness of Vespasian and Titus towards Christians renders any date for the Apocalypse in their reigns well nigh impossible (pp. 66 f.). A comparison study of the inner side of the Imperial policy was recently presented by the well known novelist, Mr. F. Marion Crawford, in his *Rulers of the South* (1901, vol. i. 360 f.), but his sensible pages hardly won adequate notice from students of the New Testament. He pointed out how the primitive martyrs were "the victims not only of devotion to their own faith, as well as of political necessity, but of the passions that individually animated their unscrupulous

judges. It may well be doubted whether the most enlightened government would tolerate the existence of a secret organization of such dimensions and importance as were attained by Christianity in the early centuries of the empire, if that organization manifested its beliefs by refusing to conform with some generally accepted regulation or practice. Justice, therefore, requires that, without at all depreciating the merit of those early Christians who suffered themselves to be torn to pieces and tortured for the true faith, we should also admit that the government which inflicted such sufferings was acting, to the best of its knowledge, for the preservation of law and order."

In the *Journal* of the American Oriental Society (vol. xxvi. 1906, pp. 315 f.), Professor G. F. Moore observes that the theory connecting the *number of the Beast* in Revelation xiii. 18 with Caligula gains strength from the fact that Caligula in Hebrew (Gaskalgas = גסקלגס קסר) is equivalent, in gematria, to 616 (3 + 60 + 100 + 30 + 3 + 60, 100 + 6 + 200). Gunkel's theory of תהום קדמוניה involves a grammatical error, on the other hand, for the "feminine ending is not used in adjectives of this type," and there is no warrant for omitting the article. Besides, "primal" is not, as Gunkel sweepingly asserts, a standing attribute of mysterious significance in Jewish writings.

JAMES MOFFATT.