

standard of the work is maintained. Any series which has Marcus Dods on Hebrews and James Moffatt on the Apocalypse is a notable series. No student of these books can hereafter afford to neglect Dods on Hebrews or Moffatt on Revelation. They are equal—the best, and that is saying a great deal when one remembers Westcott and Swete. But the other books, though among the minor ones in the New Testament, are handled in a masterly manner also and, though with variations, the work measures up to a high standard. Dr. Moffatt writes on First and Second Thessalonians with his usual brilliance and wealth of scholarship. The treatment is on a much smaller scale than the recent work of Milligan. The Pastoral Epistles are handled by Dr. Newport J. D. White. He accepts them as Pauline, but with doubts. But he has made thorough discussion of these interesting letters. Rev. W. E. Oerterly is the writer on Philemon and James (a rather odd combination, but he has done the work with fine skill). Dods on Hebrews is the only other book in Vol IV. Besides Moffatt on Revelation, Vol. V has First Peter treated by Rev. J. H. A. Hart, Second Peter by Rev. R. D. Strachan, the Epistles of John by Rev. Prof. David Smith, Jude by Dr. J. B. Mayor. The First Epistle of Peter is considered genuine by Mr. Hart and ably expounded as belonging to the time of Nero. Mr. Strachan unhesitatingly rejects Second Peter and dates it about 100 A. D. He locks horns with Bigg on this knotty subject, but Bigg's book is still the ablest one on Second Peter. Prof. Smith's work on the Johannine Epistles is very fine, full of his insight and freshness. Mayor on Jude is brief and helpful. But these volumes cannot be characterized in a sentence. Get them and go to work.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

**The Self-Revelation of Our Lord.** By J. C. V. Durell, B.D. Rector of Rothershithe. T. & T. Clark. Edinburgh, Scotland. Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York. Pages 224.

Harnack's "What is Christianity" is constantly before the mind of the author. He follows Harnack's methods and be-

gins with Harnack's assumptions, but he reaches very different conclusions. Mr. Durell is loyal to the deity of Jesus. The closing chapter is on "The Truth of the Catholic Faith". But he does not credit full historicity to the Gospel of John. "There are, however, indications that the Johannine narrative is lacking in historic perspective" (p. 6). He denies that John the Baptist could have called Jesus "the Son of God" (Jno. 1:34), for this phrase was only applied to Jesus at a later stage. But, then, was not John the Baptist present at the baptism of Jesus when the Father so addressed him? The report of the words in Matthew ("This is my beloved Son") even seems to be addressed to John. He denies (p. 61) that the Baptist heard those words. But Durell accepts the witness of the Fourth Gospel to the resurrection of Jesus (p. 123) as in harmony with that of the synoptics. The Johannine authorship is accepted (p. 77), but the writer is held to have a blurred recollection and to "have ascribed to its earlier stages teaching which in fact only belonged to the later days" (p. 79). That is a serious charge to make against John. I do not think that Durell makes good his charge. It is just as easy to suppose that John recalls the early personal revelation of Himself as the Messiah and Son of God to a small group to which John belonged. Matthew and Mark did not belong to the early ministry. Luke, of course, was a Gentile and outside of the personal work of Jesus. So John recalls this aspect of Christ's work not in the synoptic tradition. The answer of Peter, who was with John in the early days of disclosure, to the inquiry of Jesus at Cæsarea Philippi may mean merely that they are still true to Jesus, no matter what others think of him. But the book is an able one and well worthy of study. It is a sincere piece of work and executed with signal ability.

A. T. ROBERTSON.