

Harvard Theological Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/HTR>

Additional services for *Harvard Theological Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



***The Making of the New Testament.* B. W. Bacon. (The Home University Library of Modern Knowledge.) Henry Holt & Co. 1912. Pp. 256. 50 cents.**

J. E. Frame

Harvard Theological Review / Volume 7 / Issue 01 / January 1914, pp 127 - 129
DOI: 10.1017/S0017816000009548, Published online: 03 November 2011

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0017816000009548

How to cite this article:

J. E. Frame (1914). Harvard Theological Review, 7, pp 127-129
doi:10.1017/S0017816000009548

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

general reader therefore may look at it with prejudice. Although the writer has thoroughly studied the origin of institutions, he is rather final on such tentative points as the origin of infant baptism and of the episcopate. The volume is arranged on the cross-section plan; it deals clearly with important episodes; it has excellent suggestions for advanced reading; it is interesting.

HENRY B. WASHBURN.

CAMBRIDGE.

THE MAKING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. B. W. BACON. (The Home University Library of Modern Knowledge.) Henry Holt & Co. 1912. Pp. 256. 50 cents.

By *The Making of the New Testament* Dr. Bacon means the process not of combining and canonizing the New Testament writings but of their rise and growth in the formative period of the Christian religion. Viewing the literature from the standpoint of the historian of religion, the author discerns therein two leading types of thought: (1) Pauline, which is characterized as the Greek-Christian gospel *about* Jesus and as the religion of the spirit; (2) Petrine or Apostolic, which is called the Jewish-Christian gospel *of* Jesus and the religion of authority. Both types of thought start from the common confession that Jesus is Lord. But the Petrine gospel, which is broadly characteristic of the Synoptic writings, rests upon the authority of the historical Jesus and regards christology as an "apotheosis doctrine." The Pauline gospel, on the other hand, is a doctrine of incarnation, appealing to the eternal manifestation of God in man, while the story of Jesus is a drama of the supernal regions, his earthly career being only a humiliating episode in the cosmic process. Furthermore, it should seem, though the distinction between christology and soteriology is not carried out in detail, that each type of thought has its own conception of salvation. In the Petrine type the stress is laid on the social ideal of the Law and the Prophets, the messianic hope of a world-wide kingdom of God; but in the Pauline type, salvation is individualistic and personal, union with the divine, as in the Hellenistic religions of the period. At the same time the kingdom of God remains as a social organism, permeated and vitalized by Christ's spirit of service, but freed from Jewish particularism in virtue of its transcendental and cosmic character.

Apart from what Dr. Bacon calls the "Matthaean" or "Dominical" Precepts wherein the gospel *of* Jesus appears free from admixture, and apart from the ten letters of Paul in which the gospel *about* Jesus is likewise pure (at least, no stress is put on Paul's indebted-

ness to the ethical utterances of the Old Testament, the sayings of Jesus, or the traditions of primitive Christianity), the writings of the New Testament present the Petrine and the Pauline types of thought in various degrees of combination, mixture, or blending. Mark, for example, is broadly assimilated to the Pauline gospel and "displays an attitude toward the growing claims of apostolic authority and neo-legalism which in contrast with Matthew and Luke is altogether refreshing" (p. 164). On the other hand, the pseudo-apostolic Epistles such as the Pastorals, Jude, the Epistles of John, and Second Peter, which reflect the docetic heresies of a later period than Paul, and such as First Peter (a Petro-Pauline product like Mark), Hebrews (written from Ephesus to Rome by a disciple of Paul), and James (written from Rome or Syria), which come out of persecution, are all characterized more or less by the note of appeal to apostolic authority.

"Both types of gospel," the author believes, "are justified in claiming to emanate from Jesus of Nazareth; but neither without the other can claim to represent fully the significance of his spirit and life" (p. 148). The synthesis of these two types is the creative work of the unknown divine who, in the "spiritual" (i.e. symbolical) Gospel of John, applies to the story of Jesus as tradition repeated it the Pauline doctrine formulated under the Stoic Logos theories, seeking thereby to rescue the Christians who were exposed to the dangers of both Gnostics and reactionaries.

Such in brief and mainly in the words of the author is Dr. Bacon's theory of the origin and growth of the literature of the New Testament. With the general contention that the Fourth Gospel contains a striking synthesis of distinctive Paulinism, both in its idea of Christ and its idea of salvation, and of Palestinian neo-legalism, there should be wide-spread agreement; but with regard to the details difference of opinion is inevitable because of the paucity of the sources. For example, it is at least an open question whether the tradition of Papias, to which Dr. Bacon clings, that Mark is *ab initio* a Roman gospel, is so good a working hypothesis as that which conceives Mark to be originally an Aramaic gospel reflecting the opinion about Jesus in the early church at Jerusalem. We may likewise question whether there is a trace of distinctive Paulinism in the soteriology or the christology of Mark. Indeed the mind that conceived the original sources of the early chapters of Acts may be precisely the mind of Mark.

Were we to venture one word of criticism, it would be that the author makes too great demands on the previous knowledge of the

readers of the "Home University Library." On the other hand, the volume reveals an intimate and long-standing acquaintance not only with the New Testament itself but also with the complex traditions about the same in the Fathers; it manifests alertness in literary criticism and fertility of resource in combining detached data; it is replete with incidental suggestions, as, for example, that in Philemon Paul requests that Onesimus be manumitted (p. 89), or that, when Paul went to Jerusalem to visit Peter, "the story he was interested to hear had even then more to do with that common apostolic witness of the resurrection appearances reproduced in 1 Cor. xv, 3-11, than with the sayings and doings of the ministry" (p. 154); and finally it displays a pioneer robustness in constructive work which is stimulating to American scholarship.

J. E. FRAME.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
NEW YORK.

JESUS. GEORGE HOLLEY GILBERT. The Macmillan Co. 1912. Pp. xii, 321. \$1.35.

Dr. Gilbert has undertaken to write a life of Jesus which shall be at once critical and popular; which shall commend itself by the use of a sound historical method and by lucidity of presentation. That he was qualified by ripe scholarship and literary skill to perform this difficult task, his earlier works gave evidence. The present book surpasses them in grasp and in completeness, and is an important addition to the literature of the subject. It is likely to do valuable service in extending the knowledge of gospel criticism and its results among educated laymen. The introductory part dealing with the sources is of especial merit in this regard.

Dr. Gilbert's criticism and historical construction concern themselves simply with the Gospels. Their scope may be indicated by the following questions: What are the most trustworthy elements of these composite documents? and what may we learn from these elements about Jesus?

He assumes the validity of the criticism which has given the "two source" theory of the synoptics general acceptance among scholars. These older documents—the "Logia" (as, differing from most recent New Testament critics, he calls the collection of sayings used by Matthew and Luke) and Mark, he takes as the gospel in the Gospels. His supreme source is the Logia, which he calls "the fundamental Christian document," and the distinctive feature of his construction is the support found for his views in this document. The Jesus of whom the Logia informs us is the real Jesus.