German translation, but the notes discuss the Greek text. The notes are rich in linguistic material and are strictly scientific in method. Full use is made of the New Testament Apocrypha and other current literature. Windisch thinks it entirely natural that Jude, as James, should have called Jesus "Lord", instead of "Brother", but he is not sure of the authorship. He is in equal doubt about the Petrine Epistles, and is certain that Second Peter is not genuine. Windisch holds that the same man wrote the Johannine Epistles and the Fourth Gospel, but is not certain who he was. There is a wealth of learning in the notes.

Rademacher's *Grammatik* is a very able performance. It is in truth rather a grammar of the vernacular — with incidental illustration from the New Testament. It is not a detailed and formal grammar of the New Testament in the usual sense of that term. For that very reason it will be found very useful as a help to the wider knowledge of the vernacular in which the New Testament was written. The illustrations from the papyri and the inscriptions are abundant and pertinent. In the "Vorwort" the author disclaims writing a grammar in the usual sense of that term. He treats rather "die sprachliche Vorgänge" of the New Testament. This is done very finely.

Dibelius handles ably the difficult problems connected with the Thessalonian Epistles and Philippians. He gives full weight to Harnack's new idea that Second Thessalonians was written at about the same time as the First Epistle, but had a narrower circle of readers. He has done an especially fine piece of work on Philippians.

The Son of Man, or Contributions to the Study of the Thoughts of Jesus. By Edwin A. Abbott. Cambridge University Press, Fetter Lane, London. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. 1910. Pages 873. Price 16s 6d (\$5.50 net). *Diatessarica* Part VIII.

Dr. Abbott has reserved the most extended discussions of all his books in the *Diatessarica* Series for the treatment of the phrase "The Son of Man." He has, indeed, devoted a hundred pages to it in his "Notes on New Testament Criticism," not to mention "The Message of the Son of Man." But here in great detail and with much complete exegetical discussion of every

passage in the Gospels where the phrase appears, the distinguished author sets himself to the task of solving the meaning of this favorite designation of Himself in the words of Jesus. Dr. Abbott refuses to take the idiom to be a Greek mistranslation of the Aramaic *barnasha* for "Man" or "any one." He does think (p. XXI.) that "the Greek appears to have gone wrong in an attempt to render literally some Aramaic expression that cannot be rendered rightly if literally." The Greek, he holds, can only mean "the son of the above mentioned man" or "the son of the creature called man." Neither of these ideas suits the Gospels according to Dr. Abbott. But the general or representative use of the article does give a probable sense in the Gospels. Jesus as "the Son of Mankind" (his human nature and relations emphasized) does give an adequate idea. Into this phrase Jesus probably poured a Messianic content though the people as a whole did not so understand him. Yet see John 12:34. And Dr. Abbott denies that the Book of Enoch had any influence on the expression. He confines its ideas to the Bible itself and in particular to Ezekiel. He holds that "Son of Adam" is often what the phrase means. One thing is certain. No one can afford to pass by this monumental treatment of a vital subject.

A. T. ROBINSON.

The Heart of the Master. By William Burnett Wright, D.D. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston and New York. 1911. Pages 247. Price \$1.25.

This volume has received very high praise. There is genuine freshness of thought and charm of style. The author strains the idea that the Triumphal Entry was meant merely to teach the people that He was not the kind of a Messiah that they expected. That was true and the use of an ass instead of a horse would symbolize that idea. But none the less, this act did make public proclamation of His Messiahship, a thing that He had hitherto studiously avoided. It is true that Mary alone rightly understood Christ about His death. But all the same, it is more than probable that Jesus purposely defied the Pharisees and Sadducees by the Triumphant Entry. The matter was so inter-