

**A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF BIBLICAL SCHOLARSHIP
IN 1850 AND 1950 ON PROBLEMS OF
THE NATURE OF JESUS
AND THE VALIDITY OF
THE BIBLICAL ACCOUNTS**

A term paper submitted
by
Thomas F. McDaniel
to
Dr. Carl Morgan,
Professor of New Testament
Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary

February 15, 1951

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	iii
CHAPTER I. PROBLEM IN 1850	1
CHAPTER II. PROBLEM IN 1950	21
BIBLIOGRAPHY	39

INTRODUCTION

In dealing with a comparative study of the problems pertinent to Biblical scholarship in the periods of 1850 and 1950, one is confronted with such vast fields of interest and multitude of details that it becomes necessary to limit the discussion of the problems to some particular phase of the total field. It is for this reason that I am considering in this paper only those problems concerned with the attempts of scholars to discover the true and historic nature of Christ and the determination of the historicity and validity of the New Testament narratives as developed primarily in Germany around 1850 and relevant to the total field of scholarship in 1950. Other problems equally important and pertinent to Biblical scholarship during these same periods, such as textual criticism, Biblical introduction, theology, exegesis, etc. will be considered only as they enter into the discussion of the stated subject

In studying the eras of 1850 and 1950, it is impossible to isolate a definite time within the immediate periods when the problems were initially introduced. Intellectual and historical problems are rarely created overnight; and the problems of 1850 and 1950 were not among the exceptions to this generalization. (On the contrary, these problems had backgrounds which involved many years.) For decades and centuries, those who dared to doubt and deny the existence and presence of complete supernaturalism in the life and ministry of Christ and the apostolic record of these events were not only a small minority, but the few that there were were dismissed with little attention and concern. However, the nineteenth century witnesses the downfall of "tradition" as it came to be doubted, denied, and rejected. A result of this downfall was the decline of supernaturalism and the substitution of rationalism.

But even the reign of rationalism subsided to the steady growth of skepticism.

It was this growing rationalism and fatal skepticism that became the center of the stated problem in 1850. The first section of this paper will be concerned with this problem as it grew and developed in Germany and began to filter into English thought.

Within a century, the storm of skepticism, and the shocking disturbances it had created, had for the most part passed away. What followed though was not a return to the previous status quo, for the problems and questions on the nature of Jesus and the validity of the Biblical accounts still remained and were awaiting a satisfactory answer. It was the task of twentieth century scholarship to produce the answer from its growing reservoir of improved materials, method, and insight. In the second section of the paper the work and progress of the first half of the twentieth will be considered. (Here again other relevant problems will be mentioned only as they become involved in the general problem.)

CHAPTER ONE

PROBLEM IN 1850

The nineteenth century was not a silent century in the field of Biblical scholarship. In Europe, and especially in Germany, It was preceded by a century in which the characteristic atmosphere had already become one of growing doubt and criticism. The advent of new modes of thought, the accumulation of material and knowledge, and the fresh intellectual and scholarly impulses forced the nineteenth century to bring to maturity this skepticism which had been born and nursed in earlier years. Where tradition had once been accepted almost universally as an adequate and complete source of authority, it came more and more to be thought of as an impostor and an obstacle in the search for truth. Tradition was then subsequently dismissed, and the resulting vacancy was filled with both rationalism and skepticism.

The first significant influences of the rationalistic approach came from such men as Ernesti (died 1781) who formulated the principle that the “verbal sense of the Scripture must be determined in the same way in which we ascertain that of other books,” and his pupil, Johann Semler.¹ Of the two, it was Semler who marked the coming of a new era and revolution in Biblical introduction and interpretation. In the early church the interpretation had been typical, with the church fathers it had been allegorical, in the middle ages it had been dogmatic, in the Renaissance grammatical, since the Reformation confessional. But as introduced by Semler it was to be historical which implied and permitted a naturalistic explanation when desired.

1. Frederic W. Farrar, *History of Interpretation*, 402.

In his book, *Abhandlung von Freier Untersuchung des Kanon*, (Halle, 1771–1775) Semler originated and defended his new concept of interpretation; namely, there is a distinction between what in the New Testament should be regarded as “the Word of God” and that which is purposed only for moral improvement and had the nature of being temporal, local, or Jewish in context.² This view was completely opposed to the traditional view held in the first half of the century by Bengel (1734), Wetstein (1750), and Michaelis (1750) that the assumption of having an inspired Scripture could be proven through an appeal to miracles and prophecy, the incredibility of the books themselves, and through the testimony of the early church. Thus, Semler initiated the complete separation of scholarship from what he considered the “burden and restraint of tradition.

Though not by unanimous consent, the eighteenth century closed its doors with the introduction of a new critical and rationalistic approach to New Testament scholarship. It was hoped by some that the philosophical approach of Immanuel Kant would be the means whereby this new critical approach would be reduced and dismissed; but Kant’s postulates were negative in effect and only added to the rationalistic approach already created.³

In the early part of the new century, rationalistic scholarship went beyond the historical critical interpretation to a point

2. Bernhard Weiss, *A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament*. Vol.1, p. 7.

3. Eduard Reuss, *History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament*. p. 596.

where it began to theorize. Expressions of such theorizing are found in the works of J. E. C. Schmidt, who attempted to relegate all examinations respecting the origin of the New Testament material to the realm of dogmatics, and J. G. Eichhorn, by whom the attempt was made “to read and examine the writings of the New Testament from a human point of view” and raise Biblical introduction to a criticism of the canon.⁴

The situation in England was for the most part completely different than that of the continent, for in England the traditional standards of inspiration and authority still prevailed. The statement made by Locke in 1703, “[The Bible] has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth without any mixture of error for its matter,” was held in the strictest form almost everywhere in England throughout the eighteenth century.⁵ However, exceptions were present, for Conyers Middleton (1752) and Edmund Law (1774) arrived at the same conclusions as had Ernesti; and Herbert Marsh closed the century in England with an analysis of gospel origins which was neither acceptable nor compatible with the contemporary evangelical conceptions.⁶ The introduction of rationalism by these men gained little support and received even less appreciative attention.

On the continent the years immediately preceding the middle of the eighteenth century were ones in which rational-

4. Weiss, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

5. J. E. Carpenter, *The Bible in the Nineteenth Century*. p. 7.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 14.

ism was channeled into what appeared to be a more constructive movement. In Germany Friedrich Schleiermacher, whom the orthodox called a rationalist because he believed in the right to free criticism, and whom the rationalists called a mystic because he believed equally in positive spiritual qualities, founded what has been called "the psychological school of exegesis."⁷ Schleiermacher was not concerned with a restatement of a theory of dogmatics but with an indication of the necessity of going beyond the historical point of view, showing the source of faith and religion as basically a "religious feeling."⁸ Having united within his thought the principles of speculation and faith, which had generally been considered as completely hostile to each other, Schleiermacher offered hope towards a neutral and mediating position of faith and rationalism.

His advocates were divided amongst themselves depending upon their following the impulses of the faith more completely or the pursuit of added investigation and thought. Listed among them were the men of strict orthodoxy as Nitzsch and Muller and those of a rational inclination as De Wette and Gieseler. In intermediate position were Olshausen, Hagenbach, and Neander. The most notable contribution of Schleiermacher was expressed in the attitude of his followers as they concerned themselves with the finding of the higher harmony of all revelation instead of dwelling upon mere argument over subordinate points and emphasizing the lack of agreement in the letter of the Scriptures.

7. Frederic W. Farrar, *History of Interpretation*. p. 409.

8. Reuss, *op.cit.*, p. 608.

In England the work of Schleiermacher was translated by Cannop Thirwall, and an increasing change of attitude in English scholarship is noted in the translators introduction, for he states:

The doctrine of inspiration once universally prevalent . . . according to which the sacred writers were merely passive organs or instruments of the Holy Spirit . . . had been so long abandoned that it would now be waste of time to attack it.⁹

However, this “long abandoned” doctrine still held strong reins, and English scholarship retained its slowness in accepting the rationalistic approach to Biblical studies. It seems quite natural then that the next impetus of rationalism came not from the field of theology but rather from philosophy and history. It was the poet-philosopher Coleridge and the historian Arnold who announced the final introduction of historical criticism into English scholarship.¹⁰ It should be noted though that this rationalism of Coleridge and Arnold came not from skeptical and agnostic backgrounds, but it pursued the direction of Schleiermacher’s mediating school of thought.

The quieting and positive influence of Schleiermacher’s approach was comparatively short lived and soon lost in the quake of the newly developing Hegelian philosophy. Where Schleiermacher had attempted to establish the Christian conviction from the point where it met human needs and satisfied human objectives, Hegelian philosophy ushered in again the trend towards theorizing and treated religious dogma as the method whereby *a priori* principles could be explained.

9. Carpenter, *op. cit.*, 22

10. *Ibid.*, p. 28.

Hegel's "contribution" to the problems faced in Biblical scholarship came not from his works in the field of the philosophy of religion, as significant as these were, but his lasting effects came from the religious critiques of his followers: Strauss, Bauer, and Baur. It was their attempt to unite and couple the principles of Hegelian philosophy to the already existing critical and historical techniques that composed the characteristic atmosphere of Biblical scholarship around 1850.

David Friedrich Strauss, Bruno Bauer, and Fredreich Christian Baur were the three men responsible for the extreme rationalistic and skeptical atmosphere of German thought. These men who were the final products of the rationalism that had preceded their full load of criticism at the steps of Biblical scholarship between the years 1830 and 1860. Strauss and Bauer were concerned with the analysis of the New Testament accounts on the life of Jesus in order to determine the the historical validity of the total portrayal found in these narratives. Baur was concerned with the literary relationships of the Gospels to each other and their respective values when compared.

Leben Jesu (Life of Jesus), a two volume work of 1480 pages, was published between 1833 and 1836. Its author, David F. Strauss, sensed the need for a new approach toward Biblical studies as a result of the advancing historical research. The following depicts his attitude:

He ventured to believe that the time had come when all religion was to be destroyed; the hour (had come) when the sacred writings and sacred history no longer satisfied the consciousness of the age, and the claim of religion to be absolute

and divine must be abandoned.¹¹

Making use of the critical studies, the historical methods, and Hegelian constructs, Strauss sought to prove his theory that traditional material in the Biblical record was for the most part little more than the free creation of the contemporary imagination and its finished products of myths and legends.¹² Where Immanuel Kant had seen in the existence of the church adequate proof for the pre-existence of its founder, Strauss could see but the opposite. The idea of Christ could but prove itself to be the invention of an already existing and established church.¹³ Strauss was free to go further in his analysis and study than those who had preceded him for he had attained through his Hegelian philosophy an inner “emancipation” from the thoughts and feelings which had restrained his predecessors who, in their respective works had limited themselves in fear of what little would remain of the historical life of Christ were they to apply completely the concept of myth and legend.¹⁴

Not only did the Hegelian philosophy forbid normal restraint and caution in Strauss’ approach, but the Hegelain

11. H. W. Weinel and A.G. Wedgery, *Jesus in the Nineteenth Century*. p. 77.

12. Albert Schweitzer, *Quest for the Historical Jesus*. See p. 79, where Schweitzer defines “myth” as “the clothing in historic form of religious ideas, shaped by the unconsciously inventive power of legend, and embodied in historic personality.”

13. Farrar, *op. cit.*, p. 413.

14. Schweitzer, *op.cit.*, p. 79.

model became Strauss' method, namely that of synthesis, thesis, and antithesis. The criteria of his analysis was basically four-fold. First, the Biblical account could not be considered historical if its component parts were irreconcilable with the established universal laws which govern natural phenomena. Second, an account was unhistorical if it was inconsistent with itself or other parallel accounts. Third, an account was unhistorical when the actors conversed in poetry or elevated discourse which was not characteristic of their training or situation. And fourth, the account was unhistorical if it was not in agreement with the contemporary religious concepts peculiar to the region where the narrative originated.¹⁵

Th. following is a brief listing of several of the main conclusions which were the results of Strauss' extreme criticism as reviewed by Albert Schweitzer.¹⁶ All the stories prior to the baptism of Jesus are mythological for there is not only a complete lack of historical evidence outside of the Gospels, but even the Gospels' giving a genealogy indicates that the authors are endeavoring to present concepts which had not previously been suggested—the Davidic lineage being one of them. Jesus was actually a “follower” of John the Baptist and the concept of Jesus' receiving the Holy Ghost at the baptism

15. Milton S. Terry, *Biblical Hermeneutics*. p. 169. Weinel and Wedgery, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

16. Schweitzer, *op. cit.*, pp 81–84. In each case it should be noted the traditional acceptance of supernatural qualities are not merely rationalized to explain their existence in the narrative, but they are rejected and are forced to give way to his theory of mythological development.

by John arose later. If otherwise, how could John have ever doubted the office of Jesus?

The story of Jesus temptation is equally unhistorical, regardless whether it be interpreted literally or symbolically. Even the calling of the twelve disciples has its origin, not in a historical fact, but in the story of Elijah's calling Elisha. The healing ministry of Christ is true only in part, and the miracle performances are but a collection of "sea-stories and fish-stories." Strauss concluded that even the resurrection account is mythological in character as is evident from the forms the story followed in its legendary development: Matthew had access to the legend which was familiar with only the Galilaean appearances, whereas Luke has access to the legend which contained the account of an appearance in Jerusalem. Such were the conclusions of Strauss.

The manner in which Strauss derived such conclusions from the application of his criteria to the problem is illustrated very vividly in his analysis of the infancy narratives. For Strauss the accounts of the birth of Jesus are filled with a series of miraculous events (angels, dreams, visions, wandering stars, etc.) which are not true to the real world. Such events as these which are natural phenomena can have their origins only in myths and legends. The following argument is the base which he stated for such a deduction.¹⁷ The star in the east could only announce the birth of a king through the medium of astrology; but this practice had long since been recognized as superstition, and it would be absurd for one to believe that such a false and deceitful art could have been

17. Weinel and Wedgery, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

correct on this one occasion.

The infancy accounts as found in Matthew and Luke are also too divergent to be harmonized adequately. Matthew states that the birth was announced to Joseph in a dream by night, whereas Luke records that the event was announced to Mary by day. Luke likewise records that the shepherds who had witnessed the appearance of the angels had spread the news everywhere; but if this were true, how was it that no one in Jerusalem had heard of the event. Was not Bethlehem just a short distance from Jerusalem? Why also would it have been necessary for a special star to have guided the wise men to the child if all had heard? A final point necessitating a dismissal of the narratives as legendary was the different statement of Matthew as to the home of Joseph being in Bethlehem, for Luke had stated it as being in Nazareth.

Such evidence was sufficient for Strauss to discount the historical accuracy of the narratives on an internal basis, but to add to his positive proof he also submitted external evidence.¹⁸ There is a complete absence of any other account or record which attributed to Jesus a supernatural birth other than the two gospel accounts. There was also the apparent ignorance of such a fact on the part of John the Baptist and even his own family. In a similar manner, Strauss preceded to illustrate through the entire life of Jesus the error of tradition in attributing a historical value to the New Testament portrayal of Jesus.

To be certain, *Leben Jesu* stirred Biblical scholarship more than had any other previous work in this field. Strauss had denied tradition and supernaturalism, had by-passed rational-

18. *Ibid.*, pp. 82–83.

ism, and had introduced skepticism. In reply to this work, August W. Neander, August Tholuck, Edgar Quinet, and others raised their voices in protest and refutation. On the other hand there were some, such as Christoph von Ammon and Christian Wilke, who commended him and sought to continue the work thus initiated.

In 1837, *The Credibility of the Gospel* by Tholuok was published with the purpose of showing that the miracle stories as recorded in the Gospels were historically valid. One of the main indictments of Strauss' work by Tholuok was the manner in which Strauss had pursued his work under the influence of preconceived ideas. Tholuck stated:

Had this latest critic been able to approach the gospel miracles without prejudice . . . he would certainly, since he is a man who in addition to acumen of a scholar possesses sound common sense, have come to different conclusions in regard to the difficulties. As it is however, he approached the Gospels with the conviction that miracles are impossible; and on that assumption it was certain before he started that the Evangelists were either deceived or were deceivers.¹⁹

Neander produced the most significant and important criticism against the works of Strauss. His approach to the total problem was more reserve than had been the approach of Tholuck. This is evident from his statement of the problem and its answer, and through his reaction to the Prussian government which was considering banning of the works of Strauss. Having been requested to review the book *Leben Jesu* for the Prussian government, Neander reported that the book was extremely rationalistic in content and would be a

19. Schweitzer, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

danger point to the interests of the church. However, he urged the government not to suppress the book for he thought the book could be challenged by argument for argument, for the former method would be “unfavorable . . . interference with the freedom of science.”²⁰

The manner in which Neander refuted Strauss’ work is illustrated in his treatment in the miracle of Cana. Admitting that it is impossible to have any clear concept of what happened when the supernatural creative power was introduced into natural occurrences, since there had been no contemporary or immediate experiences of such, Neander concludes that it is not necessary to go to such extreme ends as had Strauss, but one may well suppose that Christ by an “immediate influence upon the water communicated to it a higher potency which enabled it to produce the effects of strong drink.”²¹ For states Neander, “Christ’s miracles are to be understood as an influencing of nature, (both) human and material.”²²

The attack of Edgar Quinet against the works of Strauss was more of an indictment against German theology as a whole as viewed from the major French scholars and from the Catholic Church. The following is a typical expression of his attitudes:

A new barbarian invasion was rolling up against sacred Rome . . . bringing their strange gods with them, . . . let

20. *Ibid.*, p. 103.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 102.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 101.

the Papacy wave back the devastating hordes into that moral wilderness which is their home.²³

Such opposition as this continued to plague Strauss through the remaining years of his life to such a degree that it could be said that *Leben Jesu* had inwardly and outwardly cost Strauss his life's blood. Yet nearly thirty years later (after the first publication of *Leben Jesu*) Strauss published another book, *The New Life of Jesus*. But this later writing taken as a whole was far inferior to his earlier work, for, having advanced in years, Strauss lacked not only the form and power of reconstruction but also original ideas necessary for another book.

In such a manner Strauss made his mark upon Biblical scholarship, but it was not long before the mark was completely erased. From the beginning, his work had been inadequate and one-sided. For while he attempted to show how the church spontaneously originated the Christ of faith, he failed to show the cause for the origin of the church or Christianity. According to Milton Terry, his four-fold criteria was illogical for a religious problem in that it simply denied miracles and stated if two counts varied both were wrong; and his criteria left the door open for any and all subjective opinions.²⁴

In 1838, shortly after the publication of *Leben Jesu*, C. H. Weisse published his critical and philosophical treatise on the same problem. This two volume work, entitled *Evangelical History*, employed the same basic principles of Strauss. His method has been termed "idealistic" for the gospel history is but an "ideal representation of the divine process by which

23. *Ibid.*, p. 108.

24. Milton S. Terry, *Biblical Hermeneutics*, p.170.

God reveals himself subjectively in man through all periods of the world's history," and the character and person of Jesus exhibits this revelation in the highest perfection.²⁵ Throughout this work, persons and events are regarded as symbolical representations of religious truths. For example, John the Baptist represents the whole body of Jewish prophets in their relation to Christ.²⁶

This work of Weisse encountered the same objections and criticisms as had the works of Strauss for he had depicted the Gospel narratives as being the products of the imagination and loving devotion of the disciples of Christ who were extremely impressed with the excellent and magnetic personality of Christ and his healing abilities.

Bruno Bauer was the next to proceed with this same problem, and he intended "to take by regular siege the fortress which Strauss had thought to surprise by storm."²⁷ As has been indicated, Strauss conceived the Christ of faith as being an invention of an already existing church based upon a historical Jesus who actually had lived, but only in the sphere of natural phenomena. On the other hand, Bruno Bauer attempted to offer positive proof that not only was it impossible for Christianity to have been founded by an individual named Jesus but there is an equal impossibility that the man Jesus had ever lived. If Jesus had ever lived there is no dependable source in existence of his life and sayings.

25. *Ibid.*, p. 711.

26. *Ibid.*, p. 710.

27. Farrar, *op.cit.*, p. 414.

At the outset of his studies and investigations, Bauer was concerned with continuing the theory of Strauss as it was stated. His writings were numerous consisting of his critique of John's Gospel (1840), volumes on the Synoptic Gospels (1841–42)), and his last work, *Christus und die Caesaren*. It is in this last work that he states his theory fully. In the midst of his investigations Bauer concluded that the myth and legend concept of Strauss was too vague to explain the apparent “transformation of a personality,” and there must be substituted for the “myth” theory the theory of “reflection.”²⁸

The life which pulses in the Gospel history is too vigorous to be explained as created by legend; it is real “experience,” only not the experience of Jesus but of the church.²⁹

By this Bauer means that the narratives are historical only in the sense that they are the experience of the church personified in and animated through an individual who was created and purposed for such a projection; namely Jesus.

Bauer's theory follows the following line of thought: “The representation of this experience of the Church in the life of a Person is not the work of a number of persons, but of a single author, the original evangelist.”³⁰ Between 117 A.D. and 135 A.D., during the reign of Emperor Hadrian, an unknown evangelist created out of his own philosophical genius the

28. Schweitzer, *op. cit.*, p. 145.

29. *Ibid.*,

30. *Ibid.*

work which is now known as the Gospel of Mark.³¹ Stemming from the philosophical and reform groups of the 'Jewish Greco-Roman world, this was to act as a philosophy of redemption for the lower classes of people. The other gospels were the later products of this same group of philosophers and reformers who were endeavoring to expand the original ideals depicted in Mark, as well as furthering the projection of the "church" experiences upon the created Christ.

The facts that Jesus is practically not mentioned in the contemporary extra-biblical literature and that what is essentially characteristic of Christianity appears almost identically in the other contemporary writings are the two main factors which Bauer considered as adequate justification for such a theory. What records of Christianity there are, Bauer attempted to discredit by stating that they must be spurious or in part falsified. And much of what exists in the New Testament narratives, Bauer dismissed as the result of evolution and addition to the original writings in order to explain the increasing experiences of the church.

The following example illustrates the manner in which Bauer dismissed much of the Gospel narratives. In the temptation experience there exists a "reflection" of the temptation experiences of the early pre-existing church.³² It presents the inner conflicts of this church as it passes through the wilderness of the world and as it is confronted with the diverse methods in its possession for the attainment of its goals. The mission of the twelve disciples is equally unhistorical in its

31. Weinel and Wedgery, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

32. Schweitzer, *op. cit.*, pp. 146–147.

literal meaning; it is a reflection of the struggles of the church as it later encounters the hostile world and severe sufferings.

It should be noted that Bauer's skepticism came from a hostile and repugnant attitude toward theologians and not from any inner compulsion to discover the truth in and about Christ. In expressing his feeling of contempt for theologians on one occasion Bauer stated:

The expression of his contempt is the last weapon which the critic has at his disposal for their (the theologians) discomfiture; it is his right to use it, that puts the finishing touch upon his task and points to the happy time when the arguments of theologians shall no more be heard.³³

This contempt was not limited to theologians alone but was extended to Christianity in general. It is this reason that his ideas of Christ to a large degree were rapidly rejected by scholars. His contemporaries considered him eccentric; and his contributions to Christian scholarship were completely negative, naturalistic, and skeptical.

Both Strauss and Bauer had availed themselves to the works and ideas of Fredreich Christian Baur and were influenced to a certain degree by him and the school of thought which he founded, called at times the Tübigen School, based upon its locations and at other times the "tendency school," based upon the nature of its theories. Baur's concern was not with the life of Jesus directly, but his interest lay in the analysis of the New Testament books and narratives.

In 1831 Baur first introduced his theory in an article

33. *Ibid.*, p. 153.

published in the *Tübigen Zeitschrift*, but he did not fully develop it until 1845 in his publication of a work entitled *Paulus*.³⁴

According to Baur, the New Testament books did not compose a canon of the “innocent, purposeless collection of legendary tales for which the disciples of Strauss might have taken them,” but all of the books, even those which seem the least artful, are constructed with “a purpose and a ‘tendency.’”³⁵ The early church yielded to the temptation of falsifying the historical narratives. Each of the New Testament books regardless of their apparent innocence was “written with a secret design to inculcate certain dogmatic views.”³⁶ These original dogmatic views are now obscured in the Biblical narratives as a result of the reworkings in later years in an attempt to cover over the original difficulties.

Basic to the Tübingen school was its theory of church history. For them the early church was split apart in bitter and hostile factions. Dissension was strong and party lines were rigid. This hostility was between the Petrine and Pauline parties in the church. The indication of the strife which is found in the New Testament is but the small remnant still visible from altered narratives. It was a controversy over the gentile gospel of Paul and the Jewish gospel of Peter. With this basic assumption of a divided church, the Tübingen school

34. George Salmon, *A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 12.

35. *Ibid.*, p. 13.

36. *Ibid.*

asserted that each book in the New Testament had a “tendency” toward the Pauline interpretation of the gospel or the Petrine interpretation.³⁷ And for the Tübingen school this underlying tendency had to be determined before one could make an analysis or factual history of the life of Christ. And discovering what was the work of later scribes, who attempted to conceal this tendency factor, made the task all the more difficult and less accurate.

The “tendency school” ultimately collapsed for it lacked evidence, made extreme hypotheses, and merely dismissed contrary evidence. The portrayal of an abrupt ending of the schism without listing any reasons is an example of the weak theorizing of the Tübingen school and the theories of F. C. Baur. Some of the other leading advocates of the “tendency theory,” though they did not all agree completely, were Edward Zeller, Albert Schweigler, Köstlin, Hilgenfeld, and Volkmar.

These were the basic problems of Biblical scholarship around 1850 as affected by the minds of the German rationalists. As has been seen, there was a change from the acceptance of tradition and complete supernaturalism to the introduction and growth of rationalism—this in turn giving way to the increasing tide of skepticism. In general, Germany was the center of the whole rationalistic development. England, France, etc. did not feel the full impact of these trends until after 1850. By the time it had spread to other countries, the weakness and shortcomings were becoming more and more apparent. It was not many years after 1850 until the cycle began to turn in reverse, going back to rationalism and

37. *Ibid.*, p. 12. Weinel and Wedgery, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

tradition and avoiding skepticism. (This was not necessarily true of Old Testament scholarship.)

As the cycle moved in reverse, it did not draw back within itself the problems and questions which had been raised. These remained to be answered. It was the hope of Biblical scholarship that a more successful medium of faith and reason would be determined so that these question and problems could be given a satisfactory answer. Within the past century this hope has been realized in part; and it is this development that will be considered now.

CHAPTER TWO

Though it is still too soon for an accurate and complete retrospect, the problems of Biblical scholarship in 1950 were basically the same as those of 1850, for, not only were the questions of 1850 still remaining since they had been answered inadequately, but the increasing discoveries, the continual development of method and technique, and the rising demand placed upon Christ and the Bible to meet the needs of a more complexed and advanced society were pressing the issue even further than it had been advanced before. And so 1950 scholarship continued to determine the accurate historical life of Christ and the historical validity of the New Testament accounts.

It should be noted that 1950 scholarship differed for the most part in its approach to the problem in comparison with the rationalistic and skeptical approach of 1850. The preceding scholarship was characterized by its inductive method and theorizing contrary to the known facts. This was not characteristic of 1950 scholarship. It is true that it remained rationalistic, but for the majority this was a deductive method.

To attain the answers to the question with which it was confronted scholarship approached the subject through a careful examination of the sources of the New Testament and through a thorough study of the contemporary environment of Jesus. The basic prerequisite to any accurate study, the ruling out of all preconceived ideas, was also employed, but with varying degrees.

First to be considered will be the attempt of scholars to determine the nature of Jesus and the New Testament through the analysis of the sources. Prior to 1918 rationalistic critics and scholars, as led by H. Holtzman, B. Weiss, T. Weiz-

sacher, and John Hawkins, had generally agreed that the solution to the synoptic problem was found in the “two-document hypothesis.”³⁸ According to this hypothesis Mark was assumed to have priority (as the oldest) over the other Gospels, and the strange *concordia discors* of Matthew and Luke could be explained by ascribing to each two common sources; namely, the Gospel of Mark and a source containing the sayings of Jesus which is usually designated as “Q” (the first letter in the German word for “source” being “*Quelle*”).³⁹

The basis for listing Mark as a source were the common subject matter (Matthew and Luke contain over half the material in Mark), common wording (Matthew and Luke reproduce 51% and 50% of Mark’s language respectively), and a common order of events (both follow Mark’s chronology largely and when one deviates the other still follows).⁴⁰ The bases for considering the probability of another source such as “Q” are that Matthew and Luke have from 200 to 250 verses peculiar to themselves and often in close agreement. These sayings are in relatively the same order in Matthew and Luke, and there are some sayings which appear in two forms in Matthew and Luke, one of these apparently Markan and thus the other form inferred by analogy was derived from

38. Edwin P. Booth, *New Testament Studies*. p. 43.

39. Laurence J. McGinley, S.J., *Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives*, p. 1.

40. Vincent Taylor, *The Gospels*. pp. 45–46.

another written source.⁴¹

Since 1918 source criticism has proceeded largely upon this basis and has enlarged its scope also to include two further aspects of this same subject: first, a study of the source material which is peculiar to Matthew and Luke not derived from Mark or “Q”; and second a study of those years between the death of Christ and the first written Gospel. Rowlingson differentiates between these by applying the term “source criticism” for the former and “form criticism” for the latter.⁴²

This differentiation was also a result of the influence of Wrede and Wellhausen. Looking back again at the turn of the century, it can be seen that the two-document hypothesis was widely accepted by everyone, although there were some divergent differences on details, such as the existence a primitive Mark (*Urmarkus*) or an earlier form of “Q.” The acceptance was so wide spread that for a time the investigations changed from a study of the sources to a study of the development of Jesus’ career. It was at this time that Wrede shook the foundation of the hypothesis and the historicity of Mark, for he had come to the conclusion that

though the author of Mark had genuine historical material at his disposal, he grouped and interpreted it in accordance with his own dogmatic ideas and the beliefs of the Christian community.⁴³

And thus, according to Wrede, tradition had to be disting-

41. *Ibid.*, pp. 20–22.

42. *Ibid.*, p. 44.

43. McGinley, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

ished from the evangelist's redaction, and the historicity of Mark was no longer valuable.

In response to this, the majority of critics sought to renew their efforts in an analysis of the sources and they continued further to solve the problems by analysis of the Gospel material as recorded. Here again then was "source criticism" and "form criticism."

One of the most significant studies in the field of source criticism was that of Canon B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, (1924). He set for himself the task of solving the questions stemming out of the material peculiar to Matthew and Luke which was not found in Mark or "Q." His conclusion was a "four-document hypothesis" instead of the two-document hypothesis. In this manner the problems—which were previously thought of as results of different recensions containing a common nucleus, or the results of a translation from other Greek or Aramaic sources, or even the results of free editorial work of the evangelists themselves—now had a satisfactory explanation.⁴⁴

The four-document hypothesis is generally as follows: in addition to Mark and "Q" there was a Jerusalem sayings-document called "M" which was used by the first evangelist. This would suggest that Luke also had access to another source to account for the material peculiar to his Gospel, this being called "L." And there were also the oral stories of the nativity peculiar to each Gospel.⁴⁵ Although Streeter makes no attempt to reconstruct "M," he believes there is ample

44. Booth, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

45. Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 9–10.

evidence for its existence in three factors. First, the evident overlapping of Mark and “Q” makes it reasonable to assume that other similar and identical sayings of Jesus have been preserved served in different cycles of tradition. Second, as Matthew conflated the material of Mark and “Q” into a mosaic, it is equally possible that he did the same with another source (“M”) and “Q.” Third, the material in Matthew exhibits a strong Jewish character which is in contrast to the Gentile material in “Q.”⁴⁶

Many other scholars and critics along with Streeter have traced the material peculiar to Luke to a special source entitled “L.” Among these have been Feine, B. Weiss, J. Weiss, Easton, and Manson. The contemporaries who agreed with Streeter most favorably were C. H. Dodd, A. H. McNeile, V. Taylor, and T. W. Manson. But criticism of Streeter’s work was not always favorable. B.S. Easton, M. Goguel, E. F. Scott, J. M. C. Crum, and F. C. Grant balanced the scale with their vigorous criticisms against Streeter’s hypothesis.

Although the whole of the four-document hypothesis is being debated, the focus of criticism is centered upon the lack of adequate criteria for separating “M” from “Q.” The opinions of F. C. Grant will illustrate the general feelings on this subject:

I am strongly convinced of the fundamental correctness of Streeter’s hypothesis of the development of Luke’s Gospel . . . (and) the conviction that *L* was a real document. . . . but I am equally strongly unpersuaded of the existence of a document, which Streeter labels ‘M,’ underlying the peculiar matter of Matthew. Neither on linguistic nor historical or

46. *Ibid.*, pp. 30–31. Booth, *op. cit.*, pp. 46–47.

literary-critical grounds does the evidence seem sufficient to warrant its isolation.⁴⁷

And it is here that Grant postulated his “multiple source theory” to take the place of Streeter’s four-document hypothesis; and Easton suggested the title “three document-hypothesis” as more applicable to the true situation. It is interesting to note the reason which Grant gives for a “multiple source theory” in preference to any of the documentary hypotheses. He states:

Instead of identifying the “peculiar” matter of Matthew as fragments of a special source or document, M, a careful examination of it suggests as equally tenable . . . the hypothesis that we have here a number of strands of tradition whose homogeneity is due, not to a single or distinct document, but to a common origin in the teaching, praxis, and worship of the early Syrian or North Palestinian church.⁴⁸

Another of the hypotheses which Streeter set forth caused a great deal of consideration. This was the “Proto-Luke” hypothesis. According to this theory Luke was not the same as Matthew (being a new edition of the Gospel of Mark), but was originally a combination of the sources “L” and “Q,” beginning with “world-historical datum” and ending with the resurrection narratives.⁴⁹ It was a complete Gospel free of all Markan influences. However, before it was published the author came across a copy of Mark and decided to enlarge his

47. Frederick C. Grant, *The Growth of the Gospels*. pp. 9–10.

48. *Ibid.*, p. 14.

49. *Ibid.*, 159.

original work by incorporating within his own work the Markan accounts.

In general most of the critics have rejected this hypothesis, especially Easton, Cadbury, Bacon. Easton was of the opinion that all that had been proven was that the author of Luke knew his sources well and his preference for “Q” and “L” could have come from sundry reasons.⁵⁰ V. Taylor and Grant were two of the critics who favored the “proto-Luke” hypothesis.

Another branch of this general field of source criticism was concerned with the sources from which Mark had derived his Gospel. Scholars and critics who had written on this field include B. W. Bacon, Streeter, Grant, Taylor, A. T. Cadoux, E. Meyer, W. Bussmann, and H. Branscomb. The general attitude of this group is well expressed in a statement of Branscomb:

The last half century of study has definitely eliminated this comfortable and easy answer (that Mark is simply the memoirs of Peter). For it has become increasingly clear that instead of the simple, direct testimony of an eyewitness we have an account made up by piecing together materials of different origin and date.⁵¹

and a statement by Rowlingson:

Peter is not eliminated as one important source of Mark’s material, but the Papias statement is interpreted in such a liberal manner as to allow for Mark’s use of other material.

Except for A. T. Cadoux none of the critics attempt to recon-

50. *Ibid.*, p. 160.

51. Booth, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

struct the sources of Mark, but they would include as a portion of the sources the “apocalyptic flyleaf” in chapter 13 and some of the passion narrative.

McNeile is one of the scholars who is not in agreement with this theory, as well as a host of the more conservative scholars who follow as stated the Papias account of Mark’s origin. This theory has not been met with any degree of general acceptance.

Perhaps the most outstanding problem of the twentieth century was that of “form-criticism.” The exponents of this type of study followed the same basic concept as had those who worked on the sources of Mark; namely, the Gospels reveal in themselves something of the processes through which their respective source material has grown. Form-criticism from its first initial works was greatly influenced by Wellhausen, especially by one of his fundamental principles:

. . . that in the Gospels we have an historical picture not of Jesus himself, but only the concept of Jesus which prevailed in the primitive community. Tradition fashioned and transmitted, as words of Jesus, ideas actually arising from the faith of the community.⁵²

(Throughout this entire discussion of form-criticism it is evident that there is a strong hangover of the ideas of Strauss and Bauer.)

To begin with, form-criticism was confronted with a two-fold problem: first it had to distinguish the tradition itself from the editorial work of the evangelists; and second, it was necessary to separate the layers of tradition as created by the community. K. L. Schmidt was the first to undertake the first

52. McGinley, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

of these two problems. His conclusions were answers to both. Upon study of the problem from this perspective, he came to the following conclusions: the source units existed in definite and fixed form prior to their incorporation into the Gospels; the framework of history listed in Mark was the creation of the evangelist; and this artificial chronology created by the evangelist could not be of great value in furnishing the details on the life of Jesus.⁵³

With this work of Schmidt, the way was open for a clear study of the individual units composing the "Gospel tradition." The studies and publications in this phase of scholarship began to multiply. First had appeared Schmidt's book, *Die Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, then followed Martin Dibelius' *From Tradition to Gospel* (1919 and translated in 1935), Rudolph Bultmann's *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (1921), and E. Fascher's *The Method of Form-Criticism* (1924). Other less important works were L. G. Bertram's *The Story of Jesus' Passion and the Cult of Christ* (1922), and L. M. Albertz's *The Synoptic Disputations* (1921). American and English scholarship later wrote extensively on the subject: B. S. Easton, *The Gospel Before the Gospels* (1928); R. H. Lightfoot, *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*; F. C. Grant, *The Growth of the Gospels* (1933); F. V. Filson, *Origins of the Gospels*; and other works by V. Taylor and D. W. Riddle.

The most significant work in this field came from Dibelius and Bultmann who independently of each other followed the introductory work of Schmidt and applied the principles of *formgeschichte* to the Gospels in general. The aim of the

53. Booth, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

method as stated by Dibelius was two-fold:

The method of *formgeschichte* has a two-fold objective. In the first place, by reconstruction and analysis, it seeks to explain the origin of tradition about Jesus and then penetrate into a period previous to that which our Gospels and their written sources were recorded. (Secondly) . . . it seeks to make clear the intention and real interest of the earliest tradition.⁵⁴

The complete aim for the whole school was to distinguish earlier and later strata from among the single units of tradition and to evaluate the historical value of these units by discovering their original form.⁵⁵

Both Dibelius and Bultmann were students of folklore, and they approached their investigation of the Gospels with a three-fold theory. First, in folklore the material falls into fixed forms and patterns which is transmitted with little or no change. Second, the forms are shaped and developed by the situation out of which the investigation came. And third, one can determine the history (apart from the history which it seeks to convey) by a study of form.⁵⁶

The result of the application of these theories of folklore to the Gospels was found in five general principles.⁵⁷ The synoptic Gospels are popular, sub-literary compositions. They

54. Martin Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, preface, p. v.

55. McGinley, *op. cit.*, pp. 2–3.

56. From lecture notes of Dr. Carl Morgan, Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary.

57. MoGinley, *op. cit.*, p.

depict the faith of the Christians who created them, not the faith of the historical Jesus. They are artificial collections of isolated units of tradition. These units originally had a definite literary form which can still be detected. And, this form was the creation of a definite social situation.

Both Bultmann and Dibelius offered theories as to the causes which operated in the formation of the tradition. Bultmann suggested the growing need for sayings of Jesus which would combat the Jewish opposition in the growing gentile churches. Dibelius on the other hand suggested and stressed the need there must have been for illustrations in the early Christian evangelism, for it was essentially a preaching mission to the unconverted and gentile world. Bultmann and Dibelius also classified the narratives in the synoptic Gospels into their corresponding literary forms. For Dibelius these forms included paradigms, which is a short illustrative notice or story of an event that is no more descriptive than is necessary to make the point for which it was introduced.⁵⁸ They are: (a) “stories” which supplement the preacher as teacher and story-teller and contain no general application; (b) legends where the additions, making it an enlarged paradigm, give individuality to some one other than Jesus; (c) epiphany stories wherein the supernatural is revealed to the chosen but hidden from the public; and (d) the “myth” which shows the doings of the divine person, which in turn explains some cosmic phenomena or cultus aspect.⁵⁹

58. Dibelius, *op. cit.*, p. xv.

59. Burton S. Easton, *The Gospel Before The Gospels*. pp. 34–41.

Bultmann on the other hand classified them as (a) “apothegms,” short, pithy sayings and significant acts that were enclosed in an historical setting and always depicted Jesus as being questioned; (b) “sayings of Jesus” which consisted of *logia* or maxims, prophetic or apocalyptic utterances, legalistic rules for the church, parables, and sayings in the first person; (c) and all the rest classified as “miracles” and “legends,” the former being defined as having independent value and the latter as that which gains significance only as it is applied to the life of a hero.⁶⁰

The contemporaries in Germany reacted immediately. Martin Albertz’ reaction and opinion—that despite the fact that the primary motives for the collection was practical and apologetical, rather than historical, the final literary form could be traced back to the utterances of Jesus himself—was wholeheartedly commended. Betram’s conclusion that the passion narrative of Mark contained more of the reflections of the early church than it did of the true historical situation was dismissed as being far more unreasonable and skeptical even than Bultmann.⁶¹

The most significant criticism in Germany came from Fascher. The entire reconstruction by Dibelius is questioned by Fascher for he thinks the assumption that “preaching” set the mood for the development of the forms is unwarranted and too heavily depended upon by Dibelius.⁶² And although

60. *Ibid.*, pp. 44–46.

61. Booth, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

62. *Ibid.*

he gave credit for Bultmann's analytical skill, he still condemned him for his extreme skepticism and inadequate criterion. In addition, Fascher also argued that "form" was inadequate and unable in itself to establish an accurate test whereby historical judgments could be made. And he in the same manner rejected the terminology used by both Bultmann and Dibelius.⁶³

The most important critiques of form-criticism outside of Germany came from England by such men as A. E. J. Rawlinson, A. H. McNeile, J. M. Creed, M. Jones, T. W. Manson, G. Kendall, and the others already cited above. Of all of these the works of V. Taylor in his *The Gospels* (1930) and *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (1933) are the most effective treatment of the subject. Although he accepts the method of form-criticism in its general approach, he (a) is less skeptical of the historical value of the tradition, (b) avoids the terminology of folklore, and (c) avoids also the extremes of Dibelius and Bultman.

C. H. Dodd in a series of articles between 1931 and 1936 took issue with Schmidt on the Gospel of Mark; but R. H. Lightfoot retained a large part of the skepticism when he stated:

For all the inestimable value of the Gospels, they yield us little more than a whisper of his voice; we trace in them but the outskirts of his way.⁶⁴

Another work in this field was that of E. B. Redlich, *Form*

63. *Ibid.*

64. H. Lightfoot, *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*. p. 225,.

Criticism, which is a review of the whole movement.

American scholarship has also entered the field of form criticism. B. W. Bacon had anticipated the ideas of Schmidt and Dibelius. Cadbury, although he criticizes the classification of material under a foreign terminology, accepts the general approach and was in full sympathy with Schmidt's conclusions. E. F. Scott also accepted the approach generally but would not go so far as to state the historical interest of Jesus played only a minor role in bringing the early Christians' thoughts of Jesus back again. J. .S. Case was influenced by Schmidt and considered Mark only a "literary mosaic." F. C. Grant was critical only of *formgeschichte* in its extremes.⁶⁵

B. S. Easton rejected the conclusions of form-criticism, for he believed that from the beginning there existed a tradition of sayings of Jesus which was highly respected. He made his greatest criticism against the ability of the early community having a creative influence upon the tradition. He stated:

Where beliefs of the Synoptic period can be distinguished with certainty from the teachings of Jesus, we find the former most scantily supported by sayings placed in his mouth.⁶⁶

In addition to these criticisms listed under the respective critiques of other scholars, the major weaknesses of the *formgeschichte* school would include the following factors. The date of the composition of Mark appears to be closer to 50 A.D. than 70 A.D. This would mean that the period of active evolution as designated by form-criticism was only approximately fifteen years, with the full development as early as 35

65. Booth, *op. cit.*, pp. 61–63.

66. Easton, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

A.D. and no later than 85 A.D. This would indicate that the eyewitnesses were a constant check on the historicity of the "tradition," both those eyewitnesses who were hostile and friendly to the new faith.⁶⁷ Another weakness of this whole school is its complete neglect of the historical testimony offered on this same question. Papias statement is dismissed as error by Dibelius and as the false view of the sub-apostolic age by Bultmann.⁶⁸

Still other shortcomings were the neglect of the role which individual influence played in the shaping of the tradition, for it was more likely that the teachings of the apostles were depended upon rather than any community creation. The inability of the form critics to explain by the rule of development out of the church those elements which were difficult and obscure for the primitive church.

Upon such conclusions the general field and science of *formgeschichte* has been widely rejected by 1950 scholarship. The ultimate question imposed upon the scholarship of 1950 was whether the truth of the matter lies in the conservatism of Easton or in a middle position between Bultmann, Bertram, and Lightfoot, on the one hand, and Easton, Burney, Albertz on the other. The question is still being studied, but the implications are pointing toward the conservative approach. The real value of form-criticism is being reduced to its pointing to the pre-synoptic period and having given an impetus to a type of study which is beneficial as a tool in the study of the historical Jesus.

67. McGinly, *op. cit.*, pp. 23—26.

68. *Ibid.*, pp. 22—23.

As was indicated earlier, the second manner in which 1950 scholarship attempted to ascertain the historicity of the New Testament (the Synoptic Gospels in particular) was through a careful study of the environment in which Jesus lived and within which the Gospels were composed.

This complete field of study is concerned mostly with the religious environment and the socio-political environment. One of the important aspects of the study of religious environment is the renewed interest in the relation of the Old Testament to the New Testament. The trend which scholarship has taken is not in the analysis of type and antitype as carried through Cooceius, Hutchinson, Marsh, and Fairbairn, but it is instead more concerned with the general Semitic backgrounds of New Testament times and the realization of Old Testament ideas and ideals in the New Testament.⁶⁹ Scholarship was seeking to see fully all that was implied in Augustine's statement, "The New Testament lies hidden in the Old: the Old Testament lies open in the New," and the statement of G. A. Smith, "The Old Testament lies not *under* but *behind* the New."⁷⁰

Perhaps more important of the scholarship in this field was that devoted to the contemporary religions of Rome, Greece, and the mystery religions of the East. Some of the conclusions reached in this sphere were for a large part extreme and rationalistic, but the greatest contribution were not found in these but in the background material which they furnished.

69. Booth, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

70. *Ibid.*, pp. 11 and 14.

The attempt some have made to derive important elements of the New Testament message from pagan cults and philosophies has been widely and rightly rejected. Study of the Gentile world throws light on the background and setting and details of the New Testament. But as Cadbury says, "There is a noticeable absence of traceable Gentile religious influence on the New Testament."⁷¹

And thus for the most part the study of the religious environment aided in a negative manner, through the argument of silence, the authenticity of the Synoptic Gospels and their portrayal of the life of Jesus. The greatest contributions to Biblical scholarship from this whole field is found in its enlightenment on the problems of the early church, not in the origin and content of the Gospels. This is true also of the socio-political and philosophical environment and will for that reason not be discussed here.

In concluding this discussion of Biblical scholarship on the questions of the historical value of the Gospels and the accounts of the life of Jesus which they contain, it should be noted that the problems have in no wise been answered completely, nor has the investigation and examination ceased. It is apparent though that the closer the faculties of intellect and reason are integrated with a deep spiritual faith, the closer the scholar is to the answers to the basic questions. The Biblical scholarship of 1975 looks extremely encouraging if these two faculties are in the future brought even closer together.

One cannot make such a survey of a problem without having come to some conclusions of one's own in reference to

71. Arnold S. Nash, *Protestant Thought in the Twentieth Century*. p. 67.

the total appearance of the problem. It would be so easy from my conservative outlook just to pass over the great works of the critics and skeptics as the ultimate results of sin and self. But I sense through it all the strange and mystical Providence of God. For in the extremes of rationalism and skepticism two dynamic factors have been the ultimate and eternal results. First, the Word of God has endured the severe test of it all. It has come out as a diamond, unharmed by the scratches and cuts of glass. It has been tempered through the ages, *not* by the mechanical acceptance of the pious, but by such blows of criticism, making it stronger with each critique. Second, the criticism has been able to remove the “fetish nature” attached to the New Testament by so many, and has made possible a much clearer understanding of the origin, nature, and content of the New Testament.

Numerous works have appeared on the general subject of life and thought in the New Testament world. Included would be Jackson and Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity* (1920); S. Angus, *The Mystery Religions and Christianity* (1925); E. R. Willoughby, *Pagan Regeneration* (1929); T. R. Glover, *The World of the New Testament* (1931); M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (1941); Riddle and Hutson, *New Testament Life and Literature* (1946); R. H. Pfeiffer, *A History of New Testament Times With an Introduction to the Apocrypha* (1949); and F. V. Filson, *The New Testament Against its Environment*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Booth, Edwin Prince, *New Testament Studies*. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1942.
- Carpenter, J. Estlin, *The Bible in the Nineteenth Century*. London: Green and Company, 1903.
- Dibelius, Martin, *From Tradition to Gospel*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935.
- Easton, Burtin Scott, *The Gospel Before the Gospels*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928.
- Farrar, F. W., *History of Interpretation*. New York: E. P. Putton Company, 1886.
- Grant, Frederick C., *The Growth of the Gospels*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1933.
- McGinley, T. M., *Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives*. Woodstook, Maryland: Woodstook College Press, 1944.
- Nash, Arnold S., *Protestant Thought in the Twentieth Century*. New York: MacMillan Company, 1951.
- Reuse, Edward, *History of the Sacred Scriptures*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1884.
- Salman, George, *A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament*. New York: E. & J. B. Young, 1889.
- Schweitzer, Albert, *The Quest for the Historical Jesus*. London: A. & C. Black Ltd., 1911.

Taylor, Vincent, *The Gospels: A Short Introduction*. London: The Epworth Press, 1945.

Terry, Milton S., *Biblical Hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.

Weinel, H. W. and Wedgery, A. G., *Jesus in the Nineteenth Century*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1914.

Weiss, Bernhard, *A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament*. Now York: Funk & Wagnals, 1889.