

urrection of Christ by W. J. Sparrow-Simpson. Dr. Jas. Stalker is ideal for the Son of God. The articles in the Appendix are as good as any in the volume and in particular Dr. Sanday's Paul. Fortunately these two volumes are not beyond the reach of most of those who need them and ought to be greatly useful.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

### **The Gospel History and its Transmission.**

By F. Crawford Burkitt, M.A., D.D., Hulsean, Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. Second Edition. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1907. Pages 366.

Dr. Burkitt has produced a very able and suggestive book. He has shown much independence in his method of treatment and is thoroughly free in his criticism as he ought to be, so far as that goes. He holds by what he calls a real historical kernel in the life and teachings of Jesus, but does not think that the Four Gospels, as we know them, can be used as history in the modern sense. I think Dr. Burkitt is too severe in the conditions that he lays down in the criticism of the Gospels. He points too narrow a basis in making Mark the criterion for judging the rest, that is Mark and the other source commonly called Q. It is in my judgment gratuitous to assume that Mark wrote down all that he knew and believed about Jesus or all that was there. Nor do we have the right to rule out as unhistorical what is not in Mark or in Matthew and Luke both (Q). Certainly more than two men wrote of Jesus (Luke says "many"), and certainly again many more knew much about what he had done and said. One of the difficulties of our criticism is that we impose arbitrary and even artificial limitations upon documents and demand that they come up (or down) to their criteria.

I must demur also to the confidence with which Dr. Burkitt dates Luke's writings at the close of the first century. It is by no means clear that Luke used Josephus. He is elsewhere a careful historian, as credible as Josephus, and Theudas is too common a name to trip Luke on. If he had used Josephus, he would hardly have Lysanias and Theudas in so different a connection. To my mind the argument goes just the other way to show that Luke did not use Josephus.

Dr. Burkitt demands also that a place be found in Mark's Gospel for the raising of Lazarus before that event can be credible. This is a curious alternative unless one is to assume that Mark knew everything about Jesus and also that he told all that he knew. Other reasons beside ignorance can be suggested for Mark's not telling the raising of Lazarus such as the brevity of his Gospel, the fact that Lazarus may still have been alive and the desire to shield him from the known purpose of the Sanhedrin to kill Lazarus. I think we need to test our criticism as severely as we do the Gospels themselves. But Dr. Burkitt keeps one awake and writes with vigor and clearness.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

### Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus.

By Alfred E. Garvie, M. A., D. D., Principal of New College, London. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York, 1907. Pages 543.

Dr. Garvie is one of the ablest British theologians. He is a Congregationalist and the Principal of New College, one of the leading Congregational theological schools. He is a thorough scholar and a patient worker with a distinct philosophical turn of mind. In this book we have his *Magnum Opus* and it is worthy of him and of the great theme.

The book is not devotional as that term is usually understood though there are devotional passages here and there. The work of Dr. Garvie is distinctly critical and severely scientific in method and spirit. He does not hesitate to put everything in the crucible of argument nor can one complain of that. On the whole and in the greatest things the author holds by the fundamental evangelical faith. He argues well for the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection, and the real Divinity of Jesus. Principal Garvie is a man of real spiritual force as well as great mental grasp and his heart beats true all through the book.

Many critical questions confront us in this really great book and one cannot expect to find agreement on them all. I would myself put many things very differently as, for instance, the Fourth Gospel, which Dr. Garvie considers by an eye-witness, but not by John the Son of Zebedee (p. 29). He assigns it to the Presbyterian John (p. 32). I will not here attempt to criti-