

A MILESTONE IN THE HISTORY OF NEW TESTAMENT RESEARCH: A REVIEW ESSAY

ROBERT YARBROUGH*

This review of William Baird's major new publication¹ will offer two major suggestions. First, Baird has produced a lengthy (565 pages) and important work that deserves to take its place alongside, and in some ways above, other celebrated treatments of the persons, issues, and periods he examines. This is a milestone in the study of the history of the discipline, for reasons to be noted in the analysis below. (And at only \$40 list in hardback, it is a bargain.)

Second, Baird makes progress in giving confessional scholars (as opposed to the figures openly critical of historic Christian teaching who dominate the volume) credit for contributing to learning. Here however, like many others in the guild, he is on a learning curve: neither Kümmel's nor Neill's respective histories of NT scholarship does enough to preserve accurately the memory of scholars in this period (or other periods) who did not fall into line with movements like rationalism, the Tübingen school, liberalism, and the history-of-religions school, all of which jettisoned key elements of historic Christianity in the interest of current trends in thought and in that sense abandoned the Christian faith (despite the frequent insistence that they were simply making it palatable for a new generation). I will observe repeatedly below that while Baird has solid knowledge, he lacks enthusiasm for the "conservative" voice in scholarship. Despite his valiant and often successful effort to be fair, in Baird's narrative this voice too frequently comes off as dull, polemical, reactionary, and an impediment to the more exciting "critical" directions that dominate the history as Baird depicts it. This does not jeopardize the usefulness of the book, but it does give it a slant which some readers will find unfortunate. For while no historical treatment can be ideal from every standpoint, this one could have been more satisfactory in its treatment of scholars who had the courage, conviction, and resourcefulness to think critically against prevailing trends which have proven with time to be seriously deficient.

This is the second of a projected three-volume series. The first appeared in 1992 and was subtitled *From Deism to Tübingen*. The third will be called *From Biblical Theology to Pluralism*. Volume two took ten years to produce,

* Robert Yarbrough is associate professor of New Testament at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2065 Half Day Road, Deerfield, IL 60015.

¹ *History of New Testament Research*, volume two: *From Jonathan Edwards to Rudolf Bultmann* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002). Parenthetical page numbers below refer to this book.

which sounds like a long time until one scrutinizes the vast reaches of literature, history, and biography Baird has covered. He has produced a remarkable and praiseworthy monument to the scholarly study of the NT in the fairly recent past, a past still very much with us today.

To some degree volume two overlaps with volume one, which covered NT scholarship from roughly the seventeenth century to the late nineteenth century. But the focus there was on Continental and British developments. Furthermore, mainly token attention was given to scholarship that did not follow the Enlightenment trends that mainstream NT scholarship today recognizes as its *Heilsgeschichte*: Grotius and Richard Simon; John Locke and the Deists; rationalists like Jean-Alphonse Turretin and Reimarus; Schleiermacher and de Wette; F. C. Baur and David Friedrich Strauss; Coleridge and Josett and Renan—volume one concedes center stage to figures like these who in hindsight did much to destroy the authority of the Bible, seen as God's Word, in the university, in wider society, and gradually even in the church and its ministers in many quarters.

The present volume does a better job of acknowledging that the work of scholars who did not see fit to deploy their intellects against the NT's gospel witness deserve respect and inclusion in a history of research, too. Accordingly, chapter one gets a running start at the nineteenth century by dropping back to Jonathan Edwards as background for taking up "New Testament Research in America during the Nineteenth Century." Central figures (in this chapter as throughout the book frequently treated in pairs or small groups) in addition to Edwards are Andrews Norton and Theodore Parker, Moses Stuart and Edward Robinson, Charles Hodge, Horace Bushnell, and Philip Schaff. While Norton, Parker, and Bushnell in important respects embrace convictions unfriendly to historic Christianity, the others largely uphold it. It is refreshing to see them get their due, though Baird is generous with his criticism when he thinks it is warranted.

As throughout the volume, Baird's method is to set the stage of each chapter and section with a brief word of introduction and comment. Then he carefully surveys selected works of a series of scholars whom he deems to be representative of the period and approach he wishes to illustrate. A short summary then concludes the chapter.

Chapter two is "The Establishment of Historical Criticism in Great Britain" and focuses chiefly on the Cambridge trio of Westcott, Hort, and Lightfoot. It is perhaps surprising that Stephen Neill's masterful treatment of these men in *The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861–1986*² receives no direct mention. On the other hand, this probably signals Baird's commitment to be independent in his exposition and not to prolong his treatment by extensive interaction with secondary sources. While the discussion is generally well-informed and illuminating, it can be asked whether a main point of the chapter is really sustained. Baird argues that the work of West-

² Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1988. Tom Wright made improvements to this book and is listed as co-author, but the material on Westcott, Hort, and Lightfoot (chapters 2 and 3) is from Neill.

cott, Hort, and Lightfoot legitimated historical criticism so that the NT could be read “like any other book” and the historical method regarded as “axiomatic” (p. 83). Or as p. 471 summarizes: “the Enlightenment approach was adopted and refined by Hort, Lightfoot, and Westcott.” I believe this misses the point made by Willis B. Glover in 1954 (*Evangelical Nonconformists and Higher Criticism in the Nineteenth Century*³) that the “historical” approach to Scripture that evolved in Britain did not tend to carry the same anti-creedal edge to it that *historisch-kritisch* approaches on the Continent did.

There is a big difference between what “historical” means for F. C. Baur’s method and findings and what it meant in the historiography of J. B. Lightfoot. In the former case we see widespread speculation, with facts serving the interests of one or more philosophical syntheses which militate against a Christian worldview. We also see no appetite for historic Christian belief, which Baur rejected in order to permit his radical reconceptualization of it. In Lightfoot’s work we see facts utilized in a construal that is more credible because it seems less indebted to an idealist schema being imposed on the data. He seems to interpret facts, not twist them. This profound contrast helps explain why to this day Bible-believing Ph.D. students are more likely to find a tolerant *Doktorvater* in English or Scottish universities than in Germany, where *historisch* by definition not infrequently means post-Christian. The Cambridge trio saw no contradiction between their prodigious learning and proclaiming the gospel (all three were heavily involved in ecclesial responsibilities at various points) or reciting the ancient creeds in good conscience. Even Hort, sometimes cast as something of a closet skeptic toward Christian faith,⁴ weighs in heavily on the confessional side in his writings.⁵ Most scholars on the Continent who plied “historical” methods were of a different mind, as Baird clearly shows. This distinction needs to have been highlighted. As it stands, the title of the chapter is essentially a misnomer unless the contrasting nuances of “historical criticism” in Germany and Britain, respectively, at the time are spelled out.

Chapter three bears the title “The Triumph of Liberalism on the Continent.” Baird moves from Ritschl to Harnack, treating Eduard Reuss, Carl

³ London: Independent, 1954.

⁴ Baird (p. 61) takes this tack, reminiscent of Neill, *Interpretation of the New Testament* 95–96. It is absent from W. F. Howard, *The Romance of New Testament Scholarship* (London: Epworth, 1949), who treats Hort at some length.

⁵ On Hort’s reverence for the ancient Christological creeds see his *Two Dissertations* (Cambridge and London: Macmillan, 1876) ix–x: Hort identifies himself as a “Christian of consistent belief,” and he says that “the great Greek Creeds of the fourth century . . . will bear severe testing with all available resources of judgment after these many ages of change. Assuredly they do not contain all truth, even within the limits of subject by which they were happily confined. But their guidance never fails to be found trustworthy, and for us at least it is necessary. Like other gifts of God’s Providence, they can be turned to deadly use: but to those who employ them rightly they are the safeguard of a large and progressive faith.” Hort is the complete antipode at this point to most of the Continental scholars Baird treats except for those few he labels “conservative.” It is therefore unfounded, at least without careful qualification, to use the “historical” work of Hort and his co-workers to legitimate anti-ecclesial academic enterprises in Germany that clearly repudiated historic Christian teaching.

Weizsäcker, Bernhard Weiss, and Holtzmann along the way. Baird admits that Weiss “looks out of place in a survey of liberalism” (p. 101), and he is right. Other scholars who bucked the rising tide of iconoclastic scholarship could have been included to avoid the impression that Weiss essentially made common cause with “liberalism” (he did not) or that he was the lone voice for a moderate orthodoxy in his time (he was not). It is true that German universities were by Weiss’s era weeding out scholars who lacked “liberal” convictions and promoting those who towed the Ritschlian (liberal) line, revered the radical (Tübingen) direction, or fell in with the burgeoning Göttingen group that would establish *religionsgeschichtlich* scholarship, all making scholars of historic Christian conviction a shrinking breed unsuited for appointment to a university chair.⁶ Yet there were scholars like J. C. K. von Hofmann, J. T. Beck, Martin Kähler, Franz Delitzsch (better known for his OT research; but see his two-volume Hebrews commentary), and perhaps another dozen figures⁷ whose achievement in NT interpretation easily rivals some of the “liberal” prototypes that Baird singles out. In any case Weiss can be credited with supporting the “liberal” direction of theological discussion only with great qualification. Baird does acknowledge that in this period “science or *Wissenschaft* . . . was becoming a religious cult” (p. 85), and the greater the liberal scholar, the more truth this observation carries. While Baird is generally more sympathetic to the critics than to the defenders of Christian tradition, he is seldom guilty of whitewashing the former.

Chapter four’s title is “The Return of Skepticism.” Scholars analyzed are Franz Overbeck, William Wrede, Julius Wellhausen (like Delitzsch a scholar of both Testaments), Adolf Jülicher, and Alfred Loisy. It is right to single all these figures out as influential in the course of NT scholarship, and Baird does a good job of characterizing each of their contributions. It may be observed, however, that their “skepticism” was already present to a considerable degree in the majority of those treated under the rubric of “liberalism” in the previous chapter. That is, when Baird accurately observes that Wellhausen’s “results, like those of Overbeck and Wrede, are predetermined by his presuppositions,” and that “his antidogmatic, antiecclesiastical bias is fostered by his liberalism” (p. 156), it may be asked whether the liberals in chapter three got off the hook a little too easily. Relative to the clear historical and theological claims of the NT documents, there may be less separating Ritschl, Holtzmann, and Harnack from the “skeptics” of chapter four than Baird’s organizational scheme suggests.

The rest of the book, chapters five through nine, treats “New Testament Research in the Era of Global Conflict.” “Era” here must be broadly interpreted, because a number of the scholars treated died before World War I even began. But this is a minor quibble in chapters so helpful for the mass

⁶ In 1880 Adolf Schlatter faced serious opposition to his appointment at the University of Bern from a dean and other faculty who resented his theological convictions despite impeccable intellectual qualifications. See Werner Neuer, *Adolf Schlatter* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995) 71–76.

⁷ For possibilities see an important work of which Baird appears to make no use: Gerald Bray, *Biblical Interpretation: Past and Present* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1996), especially pp. 328–35, 340–49.

of scholarship they summarize. Chapter five recounts "New Discoveries: Linguistic, Geographical, and Historical Research"; scholars surveyed include Cremer (died 1903), Deissmann, Grimm (died 1891), Moulton, Ramsay, Dalman, Schürer (died 1910), R. H. Charles, Paul Wendland, Edwin Hatch, and Otto Pfeiderer. Baird is at his best in synthesizing the research and empirical findings of such figures, the majority of whom excelled at lexicography, archaeology, or historical-literary backgrounds to the NT. It could be asked whether Schürer, Wendland, and Pfeiderer are really as philologically oriented as the other scholars featured; it could be argued that Schürer and Pfeiderer have more in common with the scholars of chapters three and four than they do with Cremer, Deissmann, Moulton, and Ramsay. And Wendland seems to have more in common with the history-of-religions school treated in the next chapter: he taught at Göttingen (hotbed of the movement), presents early Christianity as fundamentally syncretistic in nature, and "identifies Christianity as a Hellenistic religion" (p. 211), a decisive break with its Jewish roots. Perhaps the problem is not so much Baird's misjudgment as the inherent messiness of history and the difficulty of including everyone under clear and definite rubrics. Too many scholars do not quite fit neatly into whatever categories the historian might devise.

Chapter six treats "Methodological Developments." Baird gives a reliable summary of the broad range of innovations or refinements that arose in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries: the history-of-religions school; the thoroughgoing eschatology of Johannes Weiss and Albert Schweitzer and its implications for Life of Jesus and Pauline studies (Paul's Jewish eschatology, Schweitzer argued, was fundamental to his "Christ mysticism"); Jewish NT research by the likes of Montefiore and Klausner; Gospel studies in England by Sanday and Streeter and Burkitt and their associates; form criticism in Germany under the familiar names of Schmidt, Dibelius, and Bultmann. The chapter tends to show two things: (1) the continuing importance of "the basic historical-critical method"; and (2) "the necessity of understanding the NT documents in their historical setting" (p. 286). It also helps explain the methodological pluralism that we observe today: "the massing of data and the multiplying of methods would contribute to the increasing complexity of NT research" (p. 287).

Chapter seven is "The Advance of American New Testament Research." Baird isolates five areas for scrutiny: (1) Union Theological Seminary (New York) and scholars C. A. Briggs and James Moffatt; (2) Yale and B. W. Bacon; (3) the University of Chicago and four scholars of note there (E. D. Burton, Shailer Mathews, Shirley Jackson Case, E. J. Goodspeed); (4) American women and their participation in NT scholarship; and (5) the "conservative reaction" of B. B. Warfield and J. Gresham Machen. It is unfortunate that there is no separate heading for G. B. Stevens, who is subsumed under Bacon's section (pp. 299–300). (This feature recurs: the work of Frederic G. Kenyon [pp. 410–11] is buried under Kirsopp Lake's heading; H. A. A. Kennedy [pp. 428–29] disappears in the A. D. Nock section.) Perhaps most informative in this chapter is the survey of women's presence in NT research. Baird brings together a good deal of research done in the last quarter

century to show that women were more heavily involved in scholarly study of the NT than might be supposed. In praising someone like Julia Smith's work at Bible translation, however, Baird is drawn into making the curious observation that "the hallowed King James Version was the work of more than forty underachievers" (p. 333). The point seems to be that Julia Smith worked hard at Bible translation, harder than any male did in fact, while the KJV translators were lazy by comparison. This insinuation will be felt by some to mar the section, but perhaps it was an attempt at humor.

More serious is the lack of balance in how the Union-Yale-Chicago folk are treated, on the one hand, and how Warfield and Machen fare, on the other. Of course no one should deny that the rising mainline schools did much to further "critical" study of the NT in North America, and Baird does well to sketch highlights of how this process unfolded. And he deserves praise for at least including Warfield and Machen in meaningful ways, something historians like Neill and Kümmel did not manage. He even lauds Machen, whose book on Paul was "the work of a keen mind, a scholar of great erudition" (p. 356). At the same time, Baird confirms in this chapter what is evident throughout the book: scholars for whom it is important to uphold and defend historic Christian belief are treated with grudging praise at best, along with a hefty measure of disparagement. This tendency even tricks Baird into chronological confusion. He makes it sound like scholars at Union, Yale, and Chicago, and other truly intelligent people like Mary Edith Andrews and Mary Ely Lyman, serenely arrived at scientific results that unfortunately rendered historic Christianity untenable. This "provoked a potent reaction from conservatives spearheaded by the theologians of Princeton Seminary," notably Warfield and Machen (p. 341).

This is backwards. Both Andrews and Lyman published their major works after Warfield was dead and Machen's direction already set. Princeton Seminary had been doing its work since 1812, long before developments in the Union, Yale, and Chicago schools that Baird describes. It trained and sent out thousands of students, among them seven who were brutally murdered on foreign mission fields for their witness.⁸ Of the class of 1918, a year of world war and a flu epidemic that claimed half a million dead in the U.S. alone, one-fifth of Princeton's graduates became foreign missionaries.⁹ Meanwhile, on the home front centering in university and a growing number of liberal churches, attacks on Christian belief increased. Why not tell the story this way: "The steadfast commitment to Christ, church, and Bible found in many churches and among many ministers and missionaries provoked liberal antipathy to long-standing convictions and teachings that secularist intellectuals increasingly attacked as repugnant to reason. Established institutions like Princeton, with accomplished scholars like Warfield and Machen, continued to articulate historic interpretations of Christian

⁸ David Calhoun, *Princeton Seminary* (Edinburgh/Carlisle, PA, 1996) 2.239. Deaths were by being thrown overboard in the China Sea (one man), shootings (two men with their wives and one man separately), a stabbing in India, and mob action in China (one man and his wife).

⁹ *Ibid.* 2.309.

teaching while taking full cognizance of critical assaults, which they carefully weighed but ultimately found wanting.” Baird’s script nearly always casts the conservative scholars as polemical,¹⁰ obstinate,¹¹ and standing in the way of progress.¹² Whether Hodge, Warfield, or Machen, “a strict Calvinism combined with Scottish commonsense philosophy” (p. 353, referring to Machen) leads these men by the nose.¹³ There is no corresponding recognition of how great a role post-Kantian idealism played, combined with a Scripture-denying “Lutheranism” that Luther is unlikely to have endorsed, in the German scholarship that dominated the discipline in these years.

To Baird’s credit, in the summary of chapter seven he acknowledges that “the Chicago School published popular literature, and its members, especially Mathews, were outspoken missionaries of modernism; they vociferously attacked orthodoxy, supernaturalism, millenarianism, and fundamentalism” (p. 359). But Baird’s treatment of Mathews’s scholarship (pp. 311–17) does not relate Mathews’s views to his beliefs with the same edge of skepticism that is applied to Warfield and Machen. And he never permits himself to cast “modernism” in the same dubious light that he does “fundamentalism”: “During World War I, the anti-Tuetonic sentiment that swept the country inspired the fundamentalists to see in German NT research a threat as dreadful as the Kaiser’s stealthy U-boats” (p. 342). This apparent mild taunt is historically misleading, because alarm over liberal theology predated World War I by decades. And it is materially discouraging that a history of the period cannot see the reasonableness of anxiety over the powerful intellectual currents that changed the face of Christendom in such fateful ways—so that now, nearly a century later, Christian presence in western Europe and Britain is a desolate shadow of former times, with appalling social consequences. And it cannot have escaped Baird’s notice that heirs of the “liberal” mainline in North America are in many ways on the ropes as well.

Chapter eight moves to Continental Europe in search of “Conservative Alternatives.” Baird comes up with Ernest von Dobschütz and Paul Feine, who were critical of history-of-religions excesses; Theodor Zahn and Adolf Schlatter, whose work is billed as “conservative criticism”; and the Roman Catholic exegete Marie-Joseph Lagrange (1855–1938). While in other chapters Baird sympathetically shows how most non-conservative scholars applied methods to empirical data to arrive at their findings, in the case of these conservative scholars, “their presuppositions determine their results” (p. 395).

¹⁰ Warfield’s works were “all dedicated to an apologetic and polemical biblical theology” (p. 351).

¹¹ “Machen assumed a theological position as immovable as the Rock of Gibraltar” (p. 352). Baird does not take seriously Machen’s own claims that it was in large measure the historical evidence, not “a theological position,” that he found compelling.

¹² Warfield’s view of Scripture raises the question whether his approach “can allow a genuine historical investigation” (p. 351). The rejection of biblical authority in other scholars is seldom seen as a bias that might prejudice their observations.

¹³ On the error of seeing the Princeton theology, let alone its NT exegetes, as scholastic rationalists who were subservient to Scottish commonsense realism see Paul Kjoss Helseth, “‘Re-Imagining’ the Princeton Mind: Postconservative Evangelicalism, Old Princeton, and the Rise of Neo-Fundamentalism,” *JETS* 45 (2002) 427–50.

The Lagrange section is perhaps most significant because it sheds light on Roman Catholic NT scholarship from around 1900, a subject normally overlooked by Protestant treatments. Although Baird presents Lagrange as a conservative, he was felt by many Catholic officials of the time to be pushing critical methods to a dangerous length.¹⁴ Baird views him as conservative in part because he criticized the (eventually defrocked) Albert Loisy. But Lagrange could have been quite a bit more conservative than Loisy, yet still hardly “conservative” by Catholic dogmatic standards. The situation may have been analogous to what later developed when Hans Küng was relieved of sanction as a Catholic theologian, while Edward Schillebeeckx, less openly defiant toward church teaching than Küng but hardly “conservative,” was allowed to remain at his post, though not without opposition.

Zahn is presented as “under the sway of J. C. K. von Hofmann” and a man with “enormous confidence in the scholars of the ancient church and very little in those of his time” (pp. 367, 373). Apart from such swipes the section is courteous and helpful as an exposition of some of Zahn’s key words, too few of which have been translated. But again Baird’s weariness with scholars who think Christian belief had (and has) necessary dependence on historical facts comes through. He cannot resist citing Harnack against some of Zahn’s findings (p. 368 n. 24), though Zahn was given no voice in the section on Harnack.

It is refreshing to see Schlatter get extensive treatment, but three refinements are in order: (1) Contrary to the repeated assertion that Schlatter thinks “the NT can be understood only by those who accept its claim” (p. 375; cf. pp. 394, 474), Schlatter specialists consistently note his rejection of a fideistic hermeneutic and his high view of human cognition.¹⁵ (2) The statement that Schlatter originally published “a history of the *Church in the New Testament Period . . .* in 1910 with the title *Die Lehre der Apostel*” (p. 379) needs correction. The 1910 work was the second volume of his NT theology, which reappeared in 1922 as *Die Theologie der Apostel*. (3) It is probably not correct to credit Schlatter with commitment “to the historical-critical method” (p. 393). Was he a critical thinker? Undoubtedly. Did he affirm a critical method? Yes. But did he comply with the terms and conditions of the prevailing university philosophies and hermeneutics? Emphatically not, as his essay “Atheistic Methods in Theology” (referred to by Baird, pp. 374–75) epitomizes and as his *Die philosophische Arbeit seit Car-*

¹⁴ This is evident in repeated references to Lagrange in Gerald P. Fogarty, S.J., *American Catholic Biblical Scholarship* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1989), a book which like Baird’s defends him.

¹⁵ Schlatter could not be clearer on this point in his writings. See e.g. “Die Bedeutung der Methode für die theologische Arbeit,” *Theologischer Literaturbericht* 31 (1908) 5: “There is no special method for theological thinking, as if its form were to be distinguished from our other intellectual work. . . . It is a weighty methodological mistake when a work, whether historical or dogmatic, makes the claim to possess a special method in which its theological character consists, and this because it is valid for application only in the religious realm. . . . Theological oracles, esoteric presentations that rely solely on the assent of the initiated and like-minded, have only damaging effect on theological thought in our present situation.”

*tesius*¹⁶ amply documents. Schlatter rightly discerned that *historisch-kritisch* in the German context and in the wake of Kantian and neo-Kantian thought (cf. Ernst Troeltsch) necessarily implied methodological atheism. Schlatter did not deny that method its theoretical legitimacy for those willing to accept its premises. But he did reject its totalitarian pretensions and its claim that no other outlook, and certainly not a theistic one, could be seen as “scientific” or “critical.” Schlatter argued from the history of philosophy and theology, as well as from his own extensive historical labor, that this arbitrary and partisan position was neither purely scientific nor sufficiently critical—a line of reasoning that compares favorably with views articulated more recently by Alvin Plantinga.¹⁷ Schlatter accordingly felt that the prevalent historiography of his time deserved to be regarded with healthy skepticism. For that reason, to place him in the historical-critical camp without careful qualification is about as vast a misrepresentation of his outlook as can be imagined. Baird has done by far the best job yet of integrating Schlatter’s work into a history of NT research, but it cannot be said that this section has completed the task or even grasped Schlatter’s outlook very accurately.

The final chapter, the longest in the book, is “The Refining of Historical Criticism.” It covers developments in textual criticism (von Soden, James Rendall Harris, Kirsopp Lake), Hellenistic Greek grammar and lexicography (A. T. Robertson and Walter Bauer), Jewish backgrounds (Strack, Billerbeck, G. F. Moore), Hellenistic backgrounds (A. D. Nock), the history of early Christianity (Hans Lietzmann, Maurice Goguel, Walter Bauer again), and what Baird calls historical exegesis (Hans Windisch, Ernst Lohmeyer). This is perhaps the best chapter of all, since Baird is most comfortable, engaged, and reliable when recounting empirical researches rather than trying to untangle and assess hermeneutical or theological issues. As often elsewhere in the book, NT scholarship comes alive as biographical details of its leading practitioners emerge. I was not aware that Ernst Lohmeyer was shot by the Soviets because of his resistance as rector of the University of Greifswald to East German Communist control (p. 462). I had forgotten that James Rendel Harris was torpedoed in the Mediterranean by German U-boats *twice*, first in 1916 and then again in the following year “when he survived in the lifeboat in which J. H. Moulton perished” (pp. 401–2).¹⁸ Nor was I aware of how A. T. Robertson died with his boots on, remaining at his teaching post “until a day in 1934 when he dismissed class early and went home and died of a stroke” (p. 412). It is one of Baird’s great services to have furnished informative vignettes of so many influential scholars. The personal details enhance understanding and recollection of the course that learned study of the NT has taken in the past few centuries. A work that achieves this with Baird’s breadth, depth, and clarity deserves high praise.

¹⁶ 2d ed.; Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1910.

¹⁷ “Two (or More) Kinds of Scripture Scholarship,” *Modern Theology* 14 (1998) 243–78.

¹⁸ For more details on Harris with Moulton in the lifeboat in which the latter died from exertion and exposure, see Howard, *The Romance of New Testament Scholarship* 132–33.

Baird concludes with a huge (59 pages), accurate, and carefully ordered bibliography. It would be going too far to say that it is worth the price of the book—unless you are a specialist or advanced student looking into some of these scholars for yourself. In that case, you might feel the time Baird's work will save you to be worth every bit of the book's cost. Three excellent indices round out the end matter. When you consider that the book provides footnotes, too (not endnotes), it is clear that this work was designed with the serious user in mind, not just production costs. Both author and publisher are to be thanked.

One of the unintended ironies of the book may be inferred from Baird's helpful and consistent tendency to record when a scholar he treats is a son of the manse. It might be assumed that the "conservative" scholars treated in the book would tend to be the ones who had pastor-fathers. But in fact only Jonathan Edwards, Edward Robinson, and perhaps James Moulton (whose work was linguistic and basically non-theological) fit that description. By contrast, the list of men who grew up in pastors' homes and then turned against Christian teaching, sometimes in drastic ways, includes Holtzmann, Ritschl, Harnack, Wrede, Wellhausen, Schweitzer, Boussett, Dibelius, Bultmann, Bacon, Burton, and Goguel. Is some latent principle at work here that begs investigation? Is it simply a matter of familiarity breeding contempt? Were some, like William Sanday, apparently subverted by their continual interaction with convictions that they once opposed but gradually succumbed to (p. 264 n. 156)? Perhaps many of the fathers, like Bultmann's, were already liberal in orientation themselves. But not all were: Harnack's father agonized over Adolf's drift and told him that in his opinion, his son's view of the resurrection made him "no longer a Christian theologian" (p. 123). At the very least those of us whose vocation is Christian ministry, pastoral or scholarly, do well to note the occupational hazard to which our children, as the result of our calling, may be exposed.

It is to be hoped that William Baird, born in 1924 and therefore well into the second decade of active retirement, is already wrapping up volume three, which will reach back to the beginnings of the biblical theology movement in the 1920s and move forward from the work of such figures as Barth, Bultmann (as a theologian, not just a form critic), Vincent Taylor, F. C. Grant, H. J. Cadbury, William Manson, and many more (p. xiv). May he be granted the health and strength to speed to a strong finish in completing what will be the most comprehensive survey of the history of modern NT research ever written.