Theologischer Jahresbericht, 1901 (Das Neue Testament) Arnold Meyer, Rudolf Knopf The Princeton Theological Review 1:655. [1903]

With the number to which this installment belongs the Jahresbericht begins to appear in seven parts, the increase being due to the addition of a separate section dealing with "Vorderasiatische Literatur und ausserbiblische Religionsgeschichte" and to the separation between the Old Testament and New Testament, each now receiving a division for itself. The New Testament literature for the year 1901 is here arranged into ten groups entitled respectively: General Literature, Text and Canon, Hermeneutics, The Gospel-Problem, The Individual Gospels, Life of Jesus, Acts and the Apostolic Age, Pauline Epistles, Catholic Epistles and Apocalypse, Biblical Theology. The second and the third are from the pen of Knopf, all the remainder has been contributed by Meyer. Of the ninety pages contained in the installment the several groups receive, as might be expected, unequal shares. Biblical Theology leads with seventeen, next comes the Life of Jesus with fourteen, the Catholic Epistles and Hermeneutics come last with five and three pages respectively. In point of completeness and general correctness, the high standard of former years appears not to have suffered with the change in the staff of editors. If one misses in Meyer's work the caustic, semi-ironical tone of Holtzmann which served to impart to the latter's judgments an interest other than purely scientific, so that they were read for the sake of their personal equation and literary flavor, this loss is perhaps made up for by the corresponding gain in objectivity of representation. On the whole the tendency of the publication seems to be in the direction of objective reference rather than of incisive criticism. In our opinion still more could be done along this line to make the work void of offense for workers and readers of every shade of theological opinion, who must needs use it and would like to use it without the danger of having their theological sensibilities wounded by too great aggressiveness on the part of the reviewers.