

interval between their dates of composition was not so long as to allow time for the earlier of the two to pass from being the local form in which in a particular district the history of our Saviour's life was told to become the property of the whole Church, and thus arrive at such general circulation as necessarily to become known at a distance from its place of composition.'

We cannot but regret that Dr Salmon was not able to deal more fully with the questions connected with the Fourth Gospel. There are several hints that in this matter his change of attitude was even more complete. He makes it quite clear that he hesitates to accept its testimony against that of the Synoptic Gospels. Cf. among other passages, p. 512, where he suggests the possibility that 'the evangelist John is not a historian on whose accuracy we can rely'. But there are equally clear indications that he is not prepared to reject its authority altogether. Cf. p. 290, 'I believe that that Gospel has preserved for us some valuable traditions'; p. 429, 'However useful the Fourth Gospel is as a commentary, *written by one with special sources of information*, it is certainly of later date than the Synoptics.' In spite of his first title, 'the human element in the *Gospels*', the scope of his enquiry, which is limited to the investigation of the mutual relations of the Synoptists, did not allow of any adequate treatment of the Fourth Gospel. Its credibility 'requires separate examination' (p. 429). It would have been a great gain to us if he had had time to carry out such an 'examination'. Recent criticism of the Fourth Gospel groans under the weight of critical authority. He might have done much to free us from the '*entweder—oder*', beyond which so much of it seems unable to get. The conclusions of so candid an enquirer, who could keep his mind open even to the very last hour of his work, would have been of the greatest value.

A. E. BROOKE.

THE EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS.

St Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians. By G. MILLIGAN, D.D.
(Macmillan & Co., 1908.)

BISHOP LIGHTFOOT'S contemplated Commentary on the Epistles to the Thessalonians was never completed, and only saw the light in an inchoate form, embodied in his posthumous volume entitled *Notes on Epistles of St Paul*. Now we have a volume by Dr Milligan evidently intended to supply its place, conceived on the same scale, arranged in the same way, printed in the same type, bound with the same binding. Does it really supply the gap? Scarcely that: Dr Milligan has not the bishop's command of patristic knowledge, nor that originality and power of initiative which enables a commentator

to break ground in some new direction; yet in orderly method, in lucidity of style, in lexical and grammatical scholarship, and in the sense of proportion between the linguistic notes and the interpretation of the subject-matter, Dr Milligan is an apt pupil of his master, and as he has at command a good knowledge of the work done within the last few years on Greek Inscriptions, the papyri, and on Jewish eschatology, he has produced a very useful volume, probably the most useful commentary, for scholars, on these Epistles that exists in England.

The volume falls into three parts, Introduction, Text and Notes, and some Additional Notes. In the first part we have clear accounts of the city of Thessalonica, St Paul's relations to the Thessalonian Church, the general character of the Epistle, its style and literary affinities, its doctrine, its authenticity and integrity, and a short account of the authorities for the text, and of the chief commentaries on the Epistles: in all we have clear, careful work, and there are only two points which lie open to criticism. The number of passages quoted to illustrate the dependence of the language of these Epistles upon that of the O. T., as well as that of the words of our Lord, seems unduly great; all the passages quoted to illustrate i 8, 9, 10 on p. lviii, and those to illustrate ii 7, v 11, 18 on p. lxi, would be better omitted, as they give the appearance of an undue effort to prove a point. The dependence of the eschatological sections both on the O. T. and on the Gospel eschatology seems clear, but beyond this there is no sure standing-ground. Again, in the discussion on the authenticity of the Epistles Dr Milligan has evidently not *felt* the strength of the argument from the difficulty of reconciling 1 Thessalonians with the narrative in the Acts (he speaks as if it was easy to fit in the additional facts supplied by the Epistle with that account, whereas they nearly all contradict the *prima facie* view which that account gives), or that of reconciling the eschatological outlook of 2 Thessalonians ii with that of Romans xi: this latter point is quite cursorily put aside and never looked in the face. There is also one small detail of translation on which I should like to feel more certain that Dr Milligan is right. On p. xlvi he translates Isidore's description of St Paul, ὁ γῆν καὶ θάλασσαν ῥυθμίσας, 'who carried "music" with him wherever his influence penetrated'. This is a beautiful thought, but does the word mean more than a description of St Paul's travels, 'who measured land and sea' or 'who trained land and sea to be his instruments'?

The text is that of Westcott and Hort: the notes consist of a careful paraphrase of each paragraph, with good notes, linguistic, grammatical, and doctrinal on each verse. It might have been well to illustrate i 4 from Deut. xxxiii 12, on i 7 to bring out the climax in the

word *τύπον* ('imitatores fiunt typi' Bengel), on 1 ii 7 to quote the beautiful word *συννηπιᾷζειν* as used by Irenaeus and Cyril, on 1 iv 4 the use in the Epistle of Barnabas of *τὸ σκεῦος τοῦ πνεύματος* (c. 7), *τὸ καλὸν σκεῦος* (c. 21) is a much closer analogy than that quoted from 2 Cor. iv 7, on v 22 the metaphor from testing coin is not clearly brought out, and should have been illustrated by some of the passages quoted in Resch's *Agrapha*. Again in 1 ii 12 the present *καλοῦντος* is probably neither 'our caller', nor to be explained eschatologically, but is rather a semi-quotation of the words used by the Apostle when at Thessalonica; in 1 ii 13 the passive interpretation of *ἐνεργεῖται* is very doubtful; in 1 ii 16 the aorist *ἔφθασε* may refer to the time of the Lord's life-time, when He pronounced the doom on the Jews; in 1 iv 4 *κτᾶσθαι* need not be translated as = 'to possess', but in its strict meaning 'to acquire', 'gradually to gain the complete mastery of his body', and as such will be parallel to the gradual acquisition of the true life in St Luke xxi 19; in 1 v 12 *προϊσταμένους* seems unduly narrowed down to 'informal guidance in spiritual matters', whereas it would much more naturally refer to presiding at the meetings of the Church, whether for worship or for discipline: I doubt indeed whether the reference of this whole section to the community at large is right; it is at least possible that *ὑμᾶς* (12) and *ὑμᾶς* (14) stand in antithesis to each other; the letter would be read aloud, and the reader may be supposed to turn to the body of the faithful in 12, to the leaders of the community in 14, whereas in 15, or perhaps only in 16, the language is meant to include all; in II ii 3-12 the lawless one is identified with Beliar, the apostasy with a Jewish apostasy, and the controlling power is the Roman Empire; this is probably right, but the view of Warfield and Moffatt deserved fuller discussion than is allowed to it: on II ii 15 it would have been well to give some illustration from ecclesiastical writers who apply *οἱ κρατοῦντες* to Christians: I expect it is doubtful whether there is any connexion between the title and this verse.

The Additional Notes deal carefully with St Paul as a letter-writer, his use of the epistolary plural, his Thessalonian friends, the Divine Names in the Epistles, the history of the words *εὐαγγέλιον*, *παρουσία*, *ἐπιφάνεια*, *ἀποκάλυψις*, *ἀπακτεῖν*, *κατέχειν*, and the history of the doctrine of the Anti-Christ. The whole of this is not only careful, but full of interest: the account of St Paul as a letter-writer and of the Divine Names are especially interesting, but the discussion of words brings out the point in which Dr Milligan makes his own special contribution to exegesis, that is, in the light which he is able to throw upon Pauline Greek from the language of inscriptions and papyri, both here and in the course of the commentary. I doubt whether in any case light has come from this source sufficient to *alter* the interpretation

of any word or phrase in these Epistles; but it is clear that St Paul's language is akin to that of ordinary daily life of the time, that certain phrases which have been explained as Hebraisms or Aramaisms are of pure Greek growth; many illustrations of their meaning have been found, and in a few cases delicate shades of allusion have enriched that meaning; such are the use of *παρουσία* for the formal visit of a king, of *ἀτακτεῖν* for a schoolboy or apprentice playing the truant from his work, of *ἐπιφάνεια* as applied to the accession of a Roman emperor, of *ἀποδεκνύναι* of the formal nomination of a king or magistrate. These and many others Dr Milligan has collected with great care and discrimination, and no student will rise from a perusal of his work without a better hold on Biblical Greek. It is to be added that the book is equipped with four excellent indices, and that the printing has been most carefully done. On p. lxxxix l. 4 the references seem wrong; on p. 35 *η* occurs for *ῆ*; on 107 *ο* for *ὀ*; on 108 *ἐλλατοῦντες* for *ἐλαττοῦντες*; on p. 111 *ος* for *ὄς*; these are the only exceptions I have noticed to the author's painstaking accuracy.

WALTER LOCK.

THE TRADITIONS OF GENESIS.

The Secret of Genesis: an Astro-religious Record; by GEORGE ST CLAIR.
(Griffiths, 1907.)

The Early Traditions of Genesis; by ALEX. R. GORDON, D.Litt.
(T. & T. Clark, 1907.)

THESE two works, though written from vastly different standpoints, exemplify the changes which have been forced in the attitude of most independent minds to the early narratives in Genesis. All but a very few would agree that it is no longer possible to 'reconcile' them with scientific knowledge, and would probably hold (as with Drummond) that the past heated debates on the 'harmony' between modern science and Genesis were irrelevant. We no longer look for science in an age when there was none, and in recognizing that the Hebrews, like other early peoples, had their own conceptions of the dawn of history, we are better able to appreciate those characteristics of the Hebrew tradition which a careful comparison of the related forms brings into such strong relief. The value of the narratives having been more permanently appraised, it remains to place the results in a more historical light and to estimate their position in the religious and political development of Israel. Mr St Clair, for his part, offers 'an interpretation of Genesis which brings out the long-concealed meaning of its figurative descriptions', and 'believes that he has found the true solution of the problem which has distressed so many minds and led to so much controversy'.