

tion of Agabus about a famine over the *whole* world, though he is calm over the general early predictions of a speedy end of all things. The concern shown is like that of the German rationalists who amended the hymn, "*es schläft die ganze Welt,*" by the more accurate substitution of "*die halbe.*"

In the second part of the work we have a careful and interesting exposition which depends for its truth upon the author's more than doubtful critical views. The Epistle of James is from 44-49 A. D. and therefore one of the earliest of Christian compositions. Its silence about Jesus is due to the fact that it is addressed in part to non-believing Jews. This quiet moralistic discourse surprisingly suggests to Mr. Bartlet the tone of Francis of Assisi and Savonarola. The Epistle to the Hebrews, probably written by Apollos in 62 A. D., is addressed to Christian Jews in Caesarea, and we are furnished with an imaginative description of the reading of the Epistle to the church meeting in Caesarea and of the effect produced. This reads somewhat strangely after Zahn's powerful argument—reinforced by Harnack—that the Epistle was written to a *Hausgemeinde* in Rome. II. Peter, genuine in part, is prior to I. Peter, and the latter, written 62-63, after Paul's death, uses Paul's phraseology in order to show how thoroughly Peter was one with Paul in thought. The Apocalypse is by the Apostle John, 75-80 A. D., and a period of fifteen more years is thought to have intellectually and theologically transformed the Apostle so that he could write the Fourth Gospel and completely abandon his eschatology. The *Didache* is brought into the account as a growth in three stages between 50 and 80 A. D. Use also is made of the Epistle of Barnabas (70-75 A. D.) as well as of Jude (70-80 A. D.) who writes not against Gnostics but Nicolaitan antinomians. These opinions will indicate sufficiently the resultant construction of the Apostolic Age, a construction which does not by consistency and plausibility lend aid to the judgments on which it is based.

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

*Christianity in the Apostolic Age.* By GEORGE T. PURVES, D.D., LL.D., recently Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in Princeton Theological Seminary. [Historical Series for Bible Students, Vol. VIII.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1900. Pp. xx, 343.)

WHILE it is true that critical scholarship has outgrown most of those extravagances that marked its first stages, and has become, relatively speaking, conservative, all recent volumes of any importance upon the Apostolic Age,—unless we may accept the work of Zahn,—have shown great caution and discrimination in the use of the book of Acts as an historical source, and have shown a tendency to recognize several of the epistles of the New Testament as either reworkings of apostolic materials or as pseudonymous. It would seem, therefore, impossible for an historian of the period to avoid the serious discussion, or at least to escape

the influence of a generation of criticism. It would probably be incorrect to say that Dr. Purves has proved an exception to such an expectation, but his work gives but few evidences of critical influence. In accordance with the admirable plan of the series to which his volume belongs, he has considered briefly the sources upon which his work rests ; but in no case has he surrendered an element of the traditional view as regards the authorship of the New Testament writings, even as regards II. Peter. And although he occasionally passes lightly over the supernatural occurrences in the opening chapters of Acts, he unquestioningly accepts the book as a piece of historical work of the first order. Even when theological matters are not at issue, Dr. Purves shows unwillingness to concede anything of importance to recent scholarship. Thus as regards the location of the Galatian churches, a matter of late so ably re-argued by Ramsay, he holds steadily to the view of Lightfoot. It is therefore easy to understand why he should reject the two-source hypothesis as to the origin of the synoptic gospels, upon which New Testament scholars are so generally agreed, and prefer the hypothesis of Westcott and others of an oral gospel used by the three evangelists.

But if the book is open to serious objections from the point of view of the critical historian, it is hardly more acceptable to the historical theologian. Dr. Purves's position forbids his handling the difficult but fundamental questions as to the relation of Pauline and early Christian thought concerning the Second Coming of Christ with current Judaism, or that of other elements with current Graeco-Roman philosophy. In its exposition of the Pauline theology, however, the book is not without value. Dr. Purves is a trained exegete, to whom Paulinism is by no means a closed volume. While, therefore, the scope of the series does not permit any large treatment of biblical-theological subjects, in so far as it is devoted to direct exposition, it is welcome. Naturally, however, we should not expect in it any marked recognition of other than canonical writings as co-ordinate sources of early Christian teaching.

Altogether, therefore, we must say the volume is what its author probably intended to make it,—a well-balanced presentation of the history of the apostolic age from the point of view of those who, while using the methods of current criticism, reject such of its results as do not square with a presupposed theological position as regards inspiration.

SHAILER MATTHEWS.

*The Sources and Literature of English History from the Earliest Times to about 1485.* By CHARLES GROSS. (London and New York : Longmans, Green and Co. 1900. Pp. xx, 618.)

No scholar can look at this book without an immediate sense of acknowledgment to its author, deepening into real gratitude and appreciation as he examines it further. It is true that he may suppress a sigh when his thoughts turn to a cherished hoard of bibliographical notes and references, painfully gathered through toilsome years ; realizing that as far