

up the narratives of the Lord's Appearances. The English is beautiful and the attitude of mind reverent and spiritual. Here is as fine a specimen of real exposition as one could wish to find. Dr. Swete is open to all truth and is cautious and candid. I cannot go with him in his suggestion that the appearance of Mary and of the other women is one and the same event. But there is very little to which one can refuse to give hearty assent. The numerous Greek notes are in footnotes and are very helpful, but they do not interfere with the popular style of the book. It is refreshing to read so reassuring a book of firm faith after wandering through Dr. Kirsopp Lake's doubts about the Resurrection of Jesus. Dr. Swete's book will do one good.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Jesus.

By Arno Neuman. Translated by M. A. Canney, London, England, A. & C. Black. 1906. Pages 180.

Dr. P. W. Schmiedel has a somewhat extended introduction to the work of his pupil, Dr. Neumann. In fact it is Schmiedel all through, only not quite so offensively put. Dr. Neumann does say that the birth of Jesus is the most important date in history, though he considers and treats Jesus only as a man. These two writers take themselves seriously because they claim to be able to prove that Jesus really existed. They do to their own satisfaction, but I have heard of no converts by their arguments from among the small number who consider Jesus as purely mythical. The trouble is that what they prove is a mere barren ideality.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Luke the Physician, the Author of the Third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles.

By Adolph Harnack. Translated by Rev. J. R. Wilkinson, M. A., New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons. London, Williams & Norgate. 1907. Pages 231.

This volume is well worthy to belong to the Crown Theological Library. All that Harnack writes is interesting and the English version puts this notable book in the reach of all who care to have it. The original *Lukas der Artz* was reviewed in this journal and hence a shorter mention will now suffice.

Harnack is anxious that he shall not be considered a conservative because he believes that Luke wrote both the Gospel and Acts, (p. vi). But he cannot break the essential force of his present position that the Christian tradition took definite shape between A. D. 30 and 70. And while Harnack is willing to admit historical errors and legends in Luke, he is disposed to stand up for Luke as against Josephus (p. 123). On the whole he thinks well of Luke as a historian, though not so well as Ramsay. The arguments used by Harnack for the Lukan authorship are very strong and very solid, just the arguments that we had all grown accustomed to in the works of Hobart, Hawkins, Plummer, and Ramsay. It is a refreshing turn of the scale to see a great German scholar change his position under the influence of English scholarship. The lesson of it all is for patience and perseverance. Let us welcome all light and go on in trust. The pendulum swings and real progress toward truth is made on the whole.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Apologetic of the New Testament.

By E. F. Scott, M. A., New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons. London, Williams & Norgate. 1907. Pages 258

This is one of the best volumes in the Crown Theological Library. It is not a modern apologetic save as that is briefly outlined in the last chapter. On the other hand Mr. Scott endeavors to set forth in graphic fashion how the various New Testament books came to be written. He sketches the theological situation in vivid style and on the whole with much success. I find much of stimulus in the book as well as much of truth. In the chapters on Jesus as the Messiah and Christianity and Judaism I would not interpret the facts very differently. But the chapter on Christianity and Heathenism is written from the point of view of the union of church and state and becomes an apologetic for the modern situation in Britain. Then Mr. Scott labors to explain Paul's attitude and to justify the English and Scotch union. In doing so he fails to do justice to Paul and does more than justice to the present situation. Paul did feel interest in the state and rulers and considered them