

who was taken captive from the land of Israel to Babylon, whom Rufus (רופוס)¹ carried captive in order that the Torah might no longer exist in the land of Israel. And they counted (סמכו) the Torah, and the Prophets, and the Hagiographa, and they made no error and no mistake. The verses are 22,747, nothing less and nothing more.' These, according to Bacher,² 'are the earliest names that can be described as authorities for the Massorah.' The only other form of this tradition to which I have had access starts several generations further down, and gives 'two myriads, and two thousands and 704' = 22,704, as the number of the verses (see Neubauer, *Medieval Jewish Chronicles*, part iv. 174 [Anecdota Oxoniensia]).

¹ Tineius Rufus, governor of Judæa, 132 A.D., at the outbreak of Bar Cochba's rebellion in the reign of Hadrian (Schürer, *Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes*, Bd. i. 4te Aufl. 647 ff., 687 ff.; cf. Otto, *Hist. Doctorum Mishnicorum*, 142 ff.).

² In Winter and Wuensche, *Die jüd. Litteratur*, ii. 124.

The second entry in our Codex, above referred to, is as follows:

'Another calculation:

The verses of the Torah are	5842
" " Prophets are	9298
" " Hagiographa are	8063
The total is 23,203	

And the mnemonic sign (סימן) is the two verses'—here follows the Hebrew text of Gn 5⁵ and Nu 3⁴ which contain the numbers 930 and 22,273, the sum of which is 23,203 as above. In this connexion it may be remarked that while this total agrees with that given from the official Massorah by Dr. Ginsburg, who has treated this matter of the verse-divisions of the Hebrew text with his usual thoroughness (*Introduction*, pp. 70ff.), each of three separate entries shows a divergence from the numbers given by Ginsburg in his table, viz. 5845, 9294, 8064. But the subject is too complex and technical to be pursued further at present.

Moffatt's Introduction.¹

BY THE VEN. WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN, M.A., LECTURER ON THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINE
IN THE UNIVERSITY AND ARCHDEACON OF MANCHESTER.

THIS fine work supplies a long-felt need, an Introduction which should represent fairly and impartially the present scholarship of the present day with regard to the writings of the New Testament, and should do that in such a way as to enable the student to form his own judgment upon the many questions involved. Dr. Moffatt's book is a fitting companion volume to Dr. Driver's *Introduction to the Old Testament*.

The conclusions reached, briefly summarized, are these.

1. *Pauline Epistles*.—All the Epistles attributed to St. Paul were written by him, except Hebrews, Ephesians, and the Pastorals. Hebrews was written, c. 80 A.D., to some group in Rome or Italy by a Hellenistic Jewish Christian. Ephesians is a catholicized version of Colossians, written in Paul's name to Gentile Christendom. It is dependent also on 1 Pet, and the idiosyncrasies of style suggest a Paulinist rather than Paul himself.

¹ *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*. By James Moffatt, B.D., D.D. ('International Theological Library'). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

The Pastorals cannot be by the Apostle. They presuppose, if genuine, his release from the Roman imprisonment, and he was not released. The diction and style are un-Pauline, and in what the Epistles say about false teaching and ecclesiastical organization we find ourselves in a sub-Pauline atmosphere. They were written somewhere between the death of St. Paul and the period of Ignatius by some one who had access to private notes of the Apostle.

2. *Johannine Literature*.—John the Apostle was martyred early, and cannot therefore have written any of the books traditionally ascribed to him. The Apocalypse was written by John the Presbyter in the reign of Domitian, and the same author more certainly wrote the Second and Third Epistles. The Gospel was written by an unknown author not later than 110 A.D. The writer of the First Epistle may have had some share in the editorial process through which the Gospel reached its final form.

3. *The remaining Catholic Epistles*.—1 Pet is Petrine, written at dictation by Peter's amanuensis

Silvanus, in the seventh decade. The references to persecution apply to the Neronian persecution, and the acquaintance with one or two of St. Paul's letters is not incompatible with a Petrine authorship. Jude dates from the early decades of the second century. 2 Pet is dependent on Jude, and certainly belongs to the second century. James is also probably a second-century writing.

4. *Synoptic Gospels and Acts*.—Mark was written in its present form shortly after the events of 60–70 A.D., and is the revision of a shorter Ur-Marcus. But Matthew and Luke used not this Ur-Marcus, but the Canonical Mark. Mark did not use Q. Q was a collection of sayings, strongly marked by eschatological traits.

Matthew is based on Mark and Q, and was written between 70 and 110 A.D. Luke also used Mark and Q, and was written, c. 90 A.D., by Luke the Physician, who also wrote the Acts. The latter book cannot be dated earlier than c. 100 A.D., and may be later.

Striking and valuable characteristics of the volume are (1) the large amount of space devoted to Bibliography. That of the Fourth Gospel, e.g., occupies four pages. (2) Another valuable feature is the detailed discussion of a number of crucial passages. E.g. there is a very valuable note on p. 90 f. on the Galatian Churches, in which Dr. Moffatt advocates the North Galatian theory, and is refreshingly frank as to the passage Ac 16^{6f}. The phrase *τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν* can only mean Phrygia and the region of Galatia. 'On both sides, but especially on the South Galatian, there is too great a tendency to tamper with the text of Acts in order to bring it into line with the requirements of a theory.' (3) A third feature is the very frequent use made of the view that there are glosses in the text.

On the other hand, there are two or three pronouncements upon debatable points which in the present state of criticism seem to be too decisive for a book of this kind which will for long help to form the opinions of young students. One of these is the uncompromising advocacy of the early martyrdom of John the son of Zebedee. To scholars like Harnack, Spitta, Armitage Robinson, Sanday, the evidence adduced seems inadequate, and the question must still be regarded as one where a modern thesis has not yet won its way to general acceptance.

A similar pronouncement is that as to St. Paul's

release from imprisonment. Dr. Moffatt will not hear of it. Here, of course, he can claim much greater unanimity amongst scholars. But so long as scholars like Harnack believe that the evidence of the New Testament presupposes a release, it can hardly be regarded as a point which has been settled by criticism. A third case is that of the so-called 'little Apocalypse' in St. Mark. Dr. Moffatt believes this to date from the seventh decade and to be 'a trait of the Apocalyptic propaganda.' He can point to a growing number of scholars who assent to such a view. But the thesis is a very precarious one. The evidence is of course entirely internal, and ultimately rests on nothing more than a belief that Christ could not have uttered the words. However one may wish that He had not so spoken, it is a tampering with historical evidence to assert that He did not. The fact is, that the whole question as to the eschatological element in the Gospels is now at the same plane of criticism that the miraculous element was in the days of Strauss. It has been found to be impossible to eliminate the miraculous element from the historical sources of Christ's life, and it will probably be found equally impossible to eliminate from them the eschatological teaching. There is at present a wide-spread tendency to strain evidence in order to do so, but we regret that one who, like Dr. Moffatt, admits that Q was strongly marked by eschatological traits, should have pronounced so strongly against Mk 13.

In what he says as to the dates of the Gospels and Acts Dr. Moffatt represents a very wide-spread volume of opinion. It is therefore unfortunate that Harnack's recent volume should not have been published in time to receive some notice in this book. The younger students who use it will miss much by not having before them the evidence adduced by Harnack for dating Mark, Luke, Acts, and perhaps Matthew, all before the Fall of Jerusalem.

Some other noticeable conclusions are the following:—

2 Co 6^{14–7¹} is a fragment of some other Epistle, 11^{32–33} is a further interpolation, and 10^{1–13¹⁰} is a letter intermediate between 1 and 2 Corinthians. Ro 16^{1–23} is a note addressed Ephesus, and vv. 25–27 are a later conclusion added by a Pauline editor. The Council visit of Ac 15 is probably the same as that of Gal

2¹⁻¹⁰. The Western text of Ac 15²⁹ is a second-century text. St. Paul's silence in Gal 2¹⁻¹⁰ as to the fourfold decree of Acts suggests that the latter is a later decree ante-dated by St. Luke. The visit of Ac 11 is not unhistorical, and St. Paul's silence with regard to it is explicable.

But sufficient has been said to call attention to the value of this Introduction. In fine scholarship, in fairness of judgment, in copiousness of illustration, and in mastery of material it stands very high, and it will no doubt for long be the standard work on the subject.

The book is admirably printed. A small defect in arrangement is the fact that whilst some of St. Paul's Epistles have page headings, 'Romans,' etc.,

1 and 2 Thessalonians, Galatians (in part), Romans (in part), Colossians are headed: 'The Correspondence of St. Paul,' so, e.g., pp. 65-95, 145-159. The following are misprints:—p. 155, l. 43, 'meditating' (for mediating); 272, l. 10, 'Josephus' (for Joseph); 294, l. 20, 'Xenophon'; 313, l. 10, ἀκόλυτος; 402, l. 8, 'reduction' (for redaction); 432, l. 7, 'encyclica'; 474, l. 27, 'like' (? unlike); 479, l. 25; ἀντιλεγόμενα; 484, l. 46, 'Mansefield,' 524, l. 24, 'husbānds'; 525 n.* 'Philos'; 540, l. 32 'conciuousness'; 585, last line, 'creeping (?) estimate'; 603, l. 25, κνὶ; 624, 'Adeny.' Is 'falls to be' a phrase to be encouraged, and is 'a colossal jin' a right description of the angel of Apoc 10¹?

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE PSALMS.

PSALM LI. 17.

The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit:
A broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise.

'The Book of Psalms,' says Maurice, 'is the most wonderful book in the world, because it is the most universal; because in it saints and seers and prophets and kings prove their title to their great names, by finding that they have a greater name still,—that they are men; that they are partakers in all the poverty, emptiness and sinfulness of their fellow-creatures; that there is nothing in themselves to boast of, or claim as their own; that all which they have is His, who would have all to know Him and be partakers of His holiness. And therefore this fifty-first Psalm is, as it seems to me, the real explanation of all the Psalms, and of the continual references which they contain to another and higher King than David. It was, and is, most natural that the Jews reading of such a King, and honestly persuaded that he must be what the name *King* imports, should have rejected the notion of a broken-hearted man—a man of sorrows—as not at all answering to the idea of such a ruler and conqueror. Till they are brought as low as David himself was brought when he poured out this confession, they will not, from all the arguments and evidences in the world, find how that riddle is

solved; they will not know why only such an one could be the King, because only such an one could be the sacrifice.'¹

There are three thoughts expressed in the text, or suggested by it.

- I. The Place of Sacrifice.
- II. The Sacrifice which God despises.
- III. The Sacrifice which He does not despise.

I.

THE PLACE OF SACRIFICE.

1. Each of the doctrines of Christianity is just the uplifting to its highest issues of a principle which operates in common experience. Here is an instance. There must be an Atonement; there must be a Sacrifice: Do you doubt it? Then look into your own heart, and you will find the evidence.

In one of his immortal dialogues Plato has shown that there is no escaping the penalty of sin, and no possibility of peace until it is faced. The wrongdoer, he says, who is convicted and punished is happier than one who gets off scot-free. And this is terribly true. A sinner may shun detection and never be brought before an earthly tribunal; but there is a more awful tribunal which he cannot escape. His sin grips him, and it never lets him

¹ *The Doctrine of Sacrifice*, 96.