

Compliments

W. B. Smith

155 Rue de la Pompe


and the flight into and sojourn in Egypt, during which last period the death of Herod took place. It cannot then be placed later than the autumn of 749 A.U.C. (5-4 B.C.). The day and the month on which the whole Christian Church celebrates the event was fixed in the time of Chrysostom (about 386 A.D.) and has been retained ever since among both Eastern and Western Christians. There is no historic or scientific basis for the assignment. Some have held that as 25 December follows the winter solstice and is a period of the year at which the sun is rising day by day higher in the heavens with the new promise of spring, it was chosen arbitrarily, but fancifully, as a suitable time for celebrating the dawn of an era which brought fresh life to the human race. Others, with more reason, aver that as the Saturnalia extended in old Roman times from 17 December to 23 December, so the Christian festival was chosen at a date at which it may be thought suggestively to replace a pagan holiday during which slaves were for a few days free, sat at their masters' tables, and were served by them. Perhaps the Latin festival of the *Brumalia*, the feast "Invicti Solis" (of the "Invincible Sun") was intended to be superseded by the Christian festival of the "Sun of Righteousness." It may be observed in passing that as the supposed day of the Nativity would have occurred during the rainy season in Palestine it is extremely unlikely that shepherds would then have been watching their flocks by night in the open air.

Synchronistic Roman History.—(1) Saint Luke says that the census which took Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem took place while Quirinus (Cyrenius) was legate of Syria (Luke ii. 2). This legate, history tells us, was appointed to carry out the census to years later, 6 A.D. This had been made much of by Strauss and others, but Dr. A. W. Zumpt (see ZUMPT, AUGUST W.), the famous German philologist, in his tractate, 'Das Geburtsjahr Christi' (1869), has shown that Quirinus was twice governor of Syria, for the second time 753 A.U.C. (2) Another difficulty has been found in Saint Luke's date of Saint John Baptist's mission, which he says (Luke iii. 1) began in the 15th year of the reign of Tiberius. Tiberius did not become sole emperor until 14 A.D., but he began his reign as associate emperor with Augustus 12 A.D. (765 A.U.C.) which gives 780 A.U.C. or 27 A.D. for the date of the Baptist's ministry, when he would be in his 30th year, as was Jesus Christ (Luke iii. 23) and not 28 as if calculating from the sole reign of Tiberius. (3) The restoration of the temple by Herod the Great began 18 B.C. (John ii. 20). Forty-six years after that would be 27 or 28 A.D., which would be the commencement of our Lord's ministry in Galilee. The completion of the temple to its full magnificence was not accomplished until the day of Herod Agrippa II., 64 A.D. (Compare Josephus, 'Antiquities of the Jews,' XV. xi. 1). (4) The death of Herod I. (Acts xii. 23) occurred 44 A.D. (5) According to Tacitus, 'Annales,' xii. 52, and Suetonius, 'Claudius,' the Jews were expelled from Rome (Acts xviii. 2) by the emperor Claudius 52 A.D. (6) Festus (Porcius Festus), Acts xxv. 1, was appointed procurator of Judæa 60 A.D. (7) The persecution of Nero in which Saint Paul was put to death began 64 A.D. in the 10th year of that em-

peror's reign, while Gessius Florus was procurator of Judæa.

From the Birth of Christ to the Fall of Jerusalem.—At the time of Christ's birth C. Sentius Saturninus had been succeeded as legate of Syria by P. Quintilius Varus with whom, according to Dr. A. W. Zumpt, P. Sulpicius Quirinus was associated (Luke ii. 2). Judæa was made an imperial province under Augustus himself, who governed it by procurators, or stewards, on the deposition of Archelaus, 6 A.D. Herod Antipas continued to reign as vassal king of Galilee and Peræa, while Cyrenius (Publius Sulpicius Quirinus) carried out the census; enrolment of the population, or "taxing" (Luke ii. 2). Coponius appears to have been the first procurator and was followed, 9 A.D., by Marcus Ambivius. The appointment of Tiberius as colleague to Augustus at Rome in 12 A.D., corroborates the computation of years in Luke iii. 1. Annus Rufus was procurator in 13 A.D. and Valerius Gratus in 14 A.D. Tiberius was made sole emperor in the same year. Caiaphas was made high priest in 25 A.D., and Pontius Pilate appointed by Tiberius his procurator in Judæa 26 A.D. The last Passover of Christ, his Crucifixion, Resurrection and Ascension occurred in the early spring of 30 A.D., and the day of Pentecost on 26 May of the same year. The martyrdom of Stephen and the conversion of Saint Paul happened two or three years later, and Paul's first visit to Jerusalem took place 35 A.D. Caligula was emperor in succession to Tiberius in 37. He in turn was succeeded by Claudius in 41 A.D., the same year that Herod Agrippa was made king of Judæa and Samaria. Saul was introduced to the Christians at Antioch in 43 A.D. and Herod died in 44; in that year Cuspius Fadus was appointed by the emperor Claudius to be his procurator in Judæa. It was 45-46 A.D. that the famine raged at Jerusalem and Paul and Barnabas visited the brethren there with relief. Tiberius Alexander was procurator when the famine reached its height in 46 A.D. In 47 A.D. Paul and Barnabas made their first missionary journey together, and returned in the autumn of 49 to go to Antioch. The Council of Jerusalem took place the same year. In 50 A.D. Paul set out with Silas on his second missionary journey, in which year Claudius uttered his decree of banishment against all the Jews, sorcerers and magicians in Rome. In 51-52 A.D. Saint Paul visited Athens and Corinth, and from the latter city wrote his first and second epistles to the Thessalonians. He left Corinth early in 53 A.D. and arrived at Jerusalem in March, whence he proceeded to Antioch and wrote his epistle to the Galatians. Thence in the same year he started on his third missionary journey which ended at Ephesus, where he spent three years, 53-56 A.D. Nero succeeded to the purple in 54; the first epistle to the Corinthians was despatched 55, and in 56 Saint Paul left Ephesus and visited Macedonia and Corinth. From Macedonia he wrote his second epistle to the Corinthians, 56 A.D., and from Corinth his epistle to the Romans 57 A.D., after which he left Corinth for Jerusalem, where he was arrested in the temple and brought before the procurator Porcius Festus. He was taken to Cæsarea 57-59, appealed to Cæsar, as a Roman citizen, and was sent to Rome, 59 A.D. He was shipwrecked at Malta,

but reached Rome in March 60. While in prison (61-62 A.D.) he wrote his epistles to the Colossians, the Ephesians, the Philippians and Philemon. He was tried and acquitted early in the year 62 A.D., and made a missionary journey in Macedonia, Asia Minor, Crete, and most probably Spain (63-66 A.D.). In the meantime he wrote his first epistle to Timothy and his epistle to Titus. He wintered at Nicopolis and in the spring of 66 A.D. was sent to Rome and underwent a second trial 67 A.D., wrote a second epistle to Timothy and was put to death by the sword in the last year of Nero's reign, in the 68th year of his age, and the 35th of his conversion. The first persecution of the Christians took place under Nero, who was succeeded by Galba 68 A.D. Under Vespasian, who took the purple 68 A.D., the Romans made war on the Jews under the leadership of Titus, son of and eventually successor to Vespasian, and the destruction of Jerusalem took place 70 A.D. Consult: Lewin, 'Fasti Sacri' (1865); Ramsay, 'Saint Paul the Traveler and Roman Citizen' (1896); Ideler, 'Handbuch der Mathematischen und technischen Chronologie' (1825); Wieseler, 'Chronologische Synopse der vier Evangelien' (1843; English translation, London 1878); 'Chronologie des apostolischen Zeitalters' (1848).

19

New Testament Criticism, Status and Drift of. If the importance of a writing be estimated by the influence it exerts and has exerted on the mind of men and on the history of the human (more particularly the Caucasian) race, *Homo Europæus*, and there seems to be no other standard nearly so just, then it must be admitted that the New Testament writings so far transcend all others as to form a class of their own. This affirmation need not be argued; it is undisputed. Hence it becomes a matter of supreme interest to understand these writings, from which modern no less than mediæval history takes its start, its form, its color, and, in great measure, its inspiration. But no understanding is final or satisfactory that is not historical. The question of Zoölogy is not, "What use have cattle for their horns?" but rather, "How did cattle get their horns?" So, too, the primary query with the critic is not, "What does the New Testament teach?" (this question is left to the divine and the theologian), but How did these Scriptures come into being? Who wrote them? When? Where? Under what circumstances? And for what ends? The whole body of knowledge thus far attained, and, still more, the whole body of investigation touching these inquiries are comprehended under the title of New Testament Criticism. This latter has therefore, in first line, nothing to do with questions as to the truth or falsity of any teaching of the Scriptures, nor with any matters of doctrinal or dogmatic interpretation, except in so far as these latter may be bound up with the conclusions concerning the genesis of the Scriptures themselves. This criticism, then, is essentially a discussion of origins, and not of values. However, it need not be disguised that doctrinal values, or at least estimates, may often be seriously affected by our determination of origins. In case of some scientific verity or method, as of the Pythagorean theorem or the use of zero in numerical notation, it may be quite indiffer-

ent whether the source be found in Greece or in Egypt, in Babylon or in Japan; but in case of some article of faith, some doctrine regulative of life but beyond the reach of proof or disproof by experiment or by argument, it is by no means indifferent whether it be the dictum of some supramundane personality or some theosopheme of a sect of mystics, the utterance of an inspired Apostle or the refinement of some ancient Babylonian myth. The interest of New Testament Criticism is not then merely academic; it does not appeal solely to the cognitive faculties, to the civilization-making instinct for knowledge as knowledge: its secondary and derivative but hardly less important interests concern our active natures as well and bear upon the whole front of our practical and institutional life.

The first inquiry that meets the student of any document concerns the text itself. Is this latter an original, or is it a copy? Or perhaps the copy of a copy? In either case, has it suffered any corruption, or is it a faithful transcript? In case there be many discrepant copies — the case actually presented — there will arise many questions as to the comparative age and authenticity of these copies, as to their relations to each other, and it will perhaps be necessary to reconstruct the supposed original from the contradictory attestations of these witnesses. Such is, in general, the text problem of New Testament Criticism, one of the most highly complex that ever challenged the efforts of the human understanding.

The testimony, which is enormous in amount, exists in the form of manuscripts, both uncials and cursives, in the supposedly original tongue (the Greek), of translations, as Latin, Syriac, Æthiopic, Armenian, Gothic, of citations by the early Christian writers, of lectionaries arranged for liturgical use, of capitulations and versifications or divisions into chapters and verses, and so on. The problem of sifting and evaluating such a mass of evidence and striking the golden mean of truth would seem too difficult for human intellect, especially as there is no secure foothold at any point, nor any sure way of testing our results as we proceed. In the end there is no court of final appeal, and the whole case must be left undecided. Under such circumstances the marvel would seem to be that there should be any agreement at all, that there should not be as many minds as critics.¹ However, extremely numerous as are the points of diverse judgment, where adjudication seems hopeless, the number of agreements is still far greater, where critical opinions rest harmonious and undisturbed. Now it might be thought that this harmony would be extended and perfected by the discovery of new testimony, which of late years has proceeded apace, and by the deeper and minuter study of the long familiar evidence. But the fact is exactly the reverse. Accumulation of depositions and profounder investigations have confirmed some critical judgments, but have shaken many others and completely overthrown not a few. The problem is indeed becoming not less but more complicated with advancing knowledge, and the textual uncertainty was never before so great as it is now.

¹ So Jerome's aphorism: *tot enim sunt exemplaria pene quot codices*, in his Preface to the Gospels, addressed to Pope Damasus.

True it is that the last generation has witnessed the most brilliant attempts¹ yet made to construct the most highly probable text. Those masterly scholars, Bishop Westcott and Dr. Hort, thought they might, by a careful study of the genealogy of the various witnesses, attach a coefficient of value to each one singly and in combination, and thereby determine the original text in the overwhelming majority of cases with a close approach to certainty. Plausible and seductive as was their argumentation, and thoroughly accepted even now in many high quarters, it was yet fatally defective at many points and for several reasons, and can no longer command scientific assent. The "neutral" text which they posited, as best represented by the great Vatican MS. B, is a figment of the imagination. The deference paid to certain great uncials was unwarranted. The testimony of the Fathers and the versions was undervalued. The depreciation of the so-called Western text was undeserved. The rash assumption that F was a copy of G was unfortunate.² Closer study has shown decisively that at crucial points the witnesses upon which Westcott and Hort relied most confidently might all be misleading, and the MSS. most lightly esteemed might present the older reading. Even as the shepherd boy of old laid low the giant, so at any time may some neglected cursive or version or citation by the Fathers overthrow the most venerated uncial. Thus, the all-important word $\rho\omega\mu\eta\iota$, in Rom. i. 7, 15, is attested by nearly all the best authorities; none the less it is an interpolation (Smith, J B L 1901, Part I., p. 3 ff., Harnack, 'Preuschen's Zeitschrift' 1902, I., p. 83 f.). So, too, the position of the *Doxology* at the end of Rom. xvi. is witnessed by κ B C D and the best versions; nevertheless the position at the end of xiv. is certainly the older. The Epilogue (xiv. and xvi.) is given by nearly every authority, but, in spite of all, it is proved to be a later addendum; the Amiatinian and Fuldensian capitulations clearly point to its earlier absence.³

These examples also correct very usefully a prevalent notion that textual variations are after all merely trifles, like the fading line between Imperfect and Aorist or the impalpable refinements of Greek syntax. On the contrary, they are sometimes blinding in their illumination, in their revelation of the primitive structure of our Scriptures.

Thus, the textual facts just stated involve a complete reconstruction of our notions about *Romans*, which now seems to be no Epistle and not addressed originally to Romans, but to be a compilation of moral and theological essays, first addressed to "all those in love of God," afterwards fitted out with Prologue and Epilogue as it now stands.

So, too, the extremely important F and G variant in Rom. ix. 22, unnoticed even by the best commentators (as Godet, Sanday, Weiss, Lipsius, Hofmann), indicates clearly the pure Judaic original of this famous chapter; the Christian hand has been laid on lightly and deftly but transfigures into a cosmic theory

what was at first only a Jewish patriot's explanation of the delay of divine vengeance upon "vessels of wrath," the Pagan oppressors of his people—an observation more fatal to theological libraries than the torch of Omar. See 'The Hibbert Journal,' 1, 2, pp. 328, 329.

Still another notion must be corrected. Let no one imagine that all or nearly all the variants are mistakes or due to mistakes; very many are visibly intentional. It was the ancient habit, particularly of the Oriental, to compile and re-compile, to edit and re-edit and re-edit again, and with sacred books this habit became almost an inviolable rule. No one disputes this fact in case of the Old Testament and the Apocrypha and the extra-canonical early Christian writings. It would be well-nigh miraculous, if the New Testament Scriptures should offer exceptions. Before the establishment of the Canon no sacred awe invested the canonic, there was no apparent reason why the favorite Scriptures should not be systematically modified to keep pace with the developing Christian consciousness, very much as our creeds are altered nowadays.⁴

It is notorious that the Old Catholic heresy-hunters charged upon their opponents, Marcion, Valentinus, and the rest, that these latter had corrupted the Scriptures to suit their own heresies. The charge may often have been well-founded in the sense above defined, but it might undoubtedly have been retorted and was retorted with equal justice by the heretics upon the Orthodox. The great master, Hort, has himself said, in speaking of the "*Doxology*": "Indeed, 'copies corrupted by Marcion' need mean to us no more than 'copies agreeing in a certain reading with Marcion's copy.' . . . On the whole, it is reasonably certain that the omission is his only as having been transmitted by him, in other words, that it is a genuine ancient reading." Wetstein's great word holds good: "Various readings, almost all, are due to the zeal, ingenuity, and guesswork of transcribers." Tischendorf admits: "It can not be doubted that in the very earliest days of Christianity there were multifarious departures from the pure Scripture of the Apostles, wherein to be sure there entered naught of dishonesty or guile." Under the deeper probing of Von Soden and others the original "neutral" B-text of W.-H. turns out to be only a very learned revision; the fault of the great Vatican is that it has considered too curiously.⁵ It is impossible to blink the fact that all MSS. of all parts of the New Testament abound in readings that are plainly second thoughts. Our most ancient and revered codices reproduce only deformed, transformed, and highly elaborated originals. It is extremely noteworthy that the heretical readings are slowly coming to their rights, to be recognized as often more primitive, less subtly reflective forms. Thus in John i. 3 the Gnostics read: "And without him was made not one (thing). What was made in him was life." putting the full stop after $\epsilon\upsilon$, instead of after $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon$ (was made); and their punctuation is at

⁴In the same spirit King James' Translators, in their 'Address to the Reader,' wrote wisely and well.

⁵As Holsten was led to observe—Holsten, the *Doctor subtilissimus* of Protestantism, the matchless master of exegesis, whose imposing reconstructions of Paulinism, by their very perfection, constitute the *reductio ad absurdum* of the premises and methods he employs.

¹As by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, Weiss, von Soden.

²Smith, 'The Pauline MSS. F and G,' Am. Jour. of Theol., July and October 1902.

³Smith, 'Unto Romans,' J B L, Vol. XXI., 1902, Part II., pp. 117-169.

last adopted by W.-H. In a word, it can no longer be doubted that Scripture was made from Dogma, not Dogma from Scripture.¹

There is little reason then to hope for the establishment of a Received Text—the *ignis fatuus* of textual criticism, though not to despair of it be the last infirmity of noble minds. If such did not exist in the beginning, neither will it exist in the end. The discovery of new manuscripts, the collation of a few hundred more, will not bring the chaos to order but will make confusion worse confounded. Witness the publication of the Sinaitic Palimpsest in Syriac and the turning of attention to the famous Bezae Codex, called D: they have merely raised new problems, not settled the old. It is perfectly just, then, and highly significant when Blass no longer quotes critical editions of the New Testament, but quotes the MSS. themselves, never presuming to say what is the "true text." Such in theory at least is the position to which criticism must finally come. The critic's text, no matter how ingeniously or plausibly "berichtigt," is only the critic's text, not the "true text," after all.

And is such a mouse-like conclusion the only issue of the mountainous labors of centuries? Shall we know from year to year less and less what was the original autographic legacy, "the pure Scripture of the Apostles"? True. But this "less" is yet in a higher sense infinitely more. For we now come to recognize clearly the prime error of our assumptions thus far, and immeasurable is the progress involved in this recognition. It has, in fact, been everywhere and everywhen tacitly assumed that there *was* in each case a unique autographic original, and that the problem of textual criticism was to discover that autograph, restore that original, and explain the manifold deviations therefrom. It is no reproach to criticism to have made this assumption and upheld it for centuries. No other was so natural or so plausible; none the less, it has proved unsatisfactory. In the face of the widening and multiplying diversities of the text-tradition, we can no longer range the Gospels and Epistles side by side with the Greek histories and the Letters of Cicero and ask how did Luke or Paul write it, just as we ask how did Thucydides or Plutarch or Pliny phrase it? In the Greek and Latin classics we recognize the works of the individual consciousness, here and there marred or corrupted, but each, in the main, single, solitary, self-consistent. Not so in the New Testament Scriptures. There we are confronted less with an individual than with a collective and communal consciousness. This consciousness is not always the same. By no means. It varies widely from the Synoptics to the Johannines, from the Paulines through the Catholics, to the Apocalypse. But it is nowhere individual, nowhere unital, nowhere self-consistent;² it is everywhere communal, everywhere complicate, everywhere harmonistic. Indeed, Syncretism is by all odds the most con-

spicuous and impressive phenomenon it presents, a syncretism without a parallel in literature, unless in the Old Testament. In the latter the attempt has been made bravely and instructively, even if prematurely, to separate the components, to disentangle the "manifold wisdom" and distinguish the threads by colors. The time is not yet ripe for such an essay in the New Testament, but we may be sure that more than the seven primaries will be needed. The widely varying testimony of the MSS. greatly complicates the problem, while lending some aid in its solution. Perhaps it may be well to illustrate the state of the case by a few examples. Let us pass by the long familiar facts of the omission or varying position of the paragraph anent the Adulteress (John vii, 53—viii, 11), of the absence of the conclusion of Mark (xvi, 9-20), and many others, and fasten our eyes on the more massive fact that the variations in Acts are so extraordinary and omnipresent that the great master, Friedrich Blass, has been driven to the assumption of two originals, an α -text and a β -text. The remarkable peculiarities of the Bezae Codex (D) had been noted by F. A. Borneman as early as 1848, but critics did not follow him in regarding it as presenting the older text; its eccentricities were ascribed to the copyist, who, like the villain in the play, was thought capable of anything. Tischendorf, Westcott-Hort, and Weiss base their texts of Acts essentially on B & A C. It remained for Blass to show that this D was only one of many witnesses to a distinct Occidental text very widely ramified. It was as when one tugs mightily at some exposed root of a tree: the earth begins to stir everywhere on that side of the tree. Blass was led to think that two MSS. proceeded originally from Luke, one a memorandum (or draft) which he himself filled out into a book (the α -text or Antiochian form) for Theophilus. The draft, he thinks, remained as the β -text, at Rome, where it was elaborated into the Occidental text (*forma romana*). This theory of Blass has not maintained itself; it is naïve at many points, and it wrecks on many textual and other facts; but it has proved extremely valuable as bringing clearly to light the systematic differences of the MSS. and showing how a critic with ultra-conservative leanings (Blass dates Acts from 57-59 A.D.) is yet forced to the assumption of two primitive texts. Let one citation indicate the interval between them.

Acts xxvii, 1 (α -text): "And as it was determined for us to sail unto Italy, they were delivering both Paul and some other prisoners to a centurion by name Julius, of the Cohort Augustan."

(β -text): "So therefore the governor decided for him to be sent to Caesar, and on the morrow, having summoned a certain centurion of the Cohort Augustan, by name Julius, he delivered to him Paul with the remaining prisoners."

It remains to add that Blass has found it necessary to distinguish two texts, α and β , in Luke's Gospel as well as in Acts.

The criticism of this eminent philologist, though not attaining quite the goal proposed, may be said to mark the beginning of the end of well-meant efforts to reconstruct the unital autographic originals of the New Testament

¹ It is indeed plain on its face that a doctrine must in general antedate its literary expression, and when we find this expression in a highly composite, apophthegmatic form, we may be sure it has been forged on the common anvil beneath the alternate strokes of more than one hammer.

² Unless, perhaps, in the unicapitulars, as Philemon, Jude, 3 John.

Scriptures. The notably complex character of these latter comes out daily more and more clearly. The Baurian criticism had left the Apocalypse and the four chief Paulines as the primary and irresoluble literary records of the Apostolic Age, by which all others were to be measured and appraised. Of this sacred pentagram it was the analysis of Völter and Vischer that dissolved the first corner. These critics, especially the latter, have exhibited the Apocalypse as primarily a Judaic composition, itself highly composite, which has been overworked and christianized by one or more Christian hands. The still deeper digging of Gunkel, Bousset, Zimmern, and Jeremias has brought to light a considerable amount of exceedingly primitive, even Babylonian, mythical material, which had been cast into the alembic of the Apocalypticist. On the other hand, the extremely complex character of Romans has come clearly into evidence. Spitta has found it necessary to break it up into two Epistles; the great Lightfoot, while rejecting the crude attempt of Renan, found himself constrained to propound a theory of a Shorter Recension. Völter surrendered the unity unconditionally, and Van Manen the Paulinity in his elaborate work on *Paulus*, though he had defended it against Loman. Steck also in his widely read and very readable *Galaterbrief*. More piercing was the analysis of Pierson and Naber in their remarkable *Verisimilia*, which in spirit and principle is the most advanced of European critical productions. Independently of the foregoing, and following other methods, the present writer has exposed the concretionary structure of Romans in a series of monographs, with sufficient clearness. It can hardly be doubted that similar results await the application of similar methods to Corinthians and Galatians. Indeed it was said years ago in the *Theol. Jahresb.*, "The 2 Cor. Letter will no longer hold together."

In Romans the presence of a large body of ancient Judaic originals seems now made out. The conservative J. Rendel Harris perceives that the list of sins (Rom. i. 29-32) is based upon an ancient Jewish Vidui (Confession for the day of Atonement).¹ The same must, of course, be said of the similar list in 2 Tim. iii. 2-5. The searching analysis of Spitta and Masseebian shows clearly that the Epistle of James is almost wholly Judaic, christianized by a few insignificant interpolations.

The problem of discovering the original elements, often Jewish, of the New Testament compositions, has been propounded only recently and has not yet advanced far towards solution. But the progress already made is most encouraging. That way lies truth—of this the day for doubt seems gone forever.

Closely connected with this quest is another, for the sources of the Scripture quotations attributed to the Gnostics by the Fathers. Thus far it has been held unsuspectingly that the Gnostics quoted from our Canonics or from parallel, still later sources. Inasmuch as the matter is of fundamental importance, it has appeared well to the writer to subject it to a minute and exhaustive investigation, which should include primarily Hippolytus, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria. As a re-

sult of this investigation, though not yet completed, it may be declared that no evidence has yet come to light that the Gnostics ever used our Canonics; on the contrary, it appears certain that the Gnostics derived largely from sources now lost but certainly presenting much of our present canonic matter in a cruder, more primitive, less elaborate form. By every token these sources contained this matter in far more natural connection than it appears in at present. The new light that is thus thrown upon the anharmonies and asyndeta of the New Testament is often surprising. The transformations are often complete and effected in queerly ingenious manner. We now begin to feel the force of the oracle in Matt. xiii. 52: "Every scribe disciplined for the kingdom of the heavens is like unto a householder that brings forth from his treasure things new and things old." A few examples must here suffice. In Matt. xiii. 3-9, Mark iv. 3-9, Luke viii. 5-8, we read the Parable of the Sower. In Matt. xiii. 19-23, Mc. iv. 14-20, Luke viii. 11-15, it is carefully expounded. The seed is declared to be "the Logos of God," the Sower is not interpreted, but is left to be understood of the Jesus or indeed of any preacher of the Gospel. Critics, even the keenest, as Koetsveld, Jülicher, Bugge, have never yet been able to satisfy even themselves concerning the interpretation, still less concerning the expressed design of the parables, to blind the hearers. Jülicher declares this latter to be impossible, especially for Jesus, and puts the dilemma sharply: "Either the Evangelists or Jesus." No solution is found in the New Testament, but on turning to Hippolytus (*Philosophumena*, v. 8) we find given as a "saying" of the oldest pre-Christian Gnostics, the Naassenes, the following *Allegory of Creation*: "Forth went the Sower for to sow: And some fell by the wayside and were trodden down; and some upon the stony places and sprang up (he says), and through not having depth were withered and died; and some fell (he says) upon the earth the fair and good and made fruit; some a hundred and some sixty and some thirty. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear." . . . Here the Sower is none other than God himself; the seed is the Logos, the *spermatic Logos*, the seminal Reason of the Stoics; the three classes are the elsewhere familiar Choics, Psychics, Pneumatics (all known to the New Testament), otherwise named the Captives, the Called, the Chosen. (A paper read by the writer before the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, New York 28 Dec. 1904.)

In the Gospels the phraseology has been expanded and enlivened, the Hebraism "in his sowing" (*ἐν τῷ σπείρειν αὐτόν*) has intruded itself from the Lucan source, a 4th class has been inserted in the 3d (by Justin in the 2d) place, and the application made is entirely new.

In Matt. vii. 13, 14, we read the famous exhortation as to the gates: "Enter ye in by the narrow gate: for wide (is the gate), and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many be they that enter in thereby. For [how] narrow is the gate, and straitened the way, that leadeth unto life, and few be they that find it." The passage is quite unconnected with its context; there is never any hint as to interpretation; it is a mystery even to Zahn; it is impossi-

¹ *The Teaching of the Apostles*, pp. 83-7.
Vol. 11-2

ble in its present setting. But in Hippolytus (op. cit., v. 8) we find the Eleusinian doctrine of the two gates: the one into the lower common life of flesh and soul, through which all enter at birth, the other into the higher life of spirit, through which only the initiates may fare; then is given as a saying of "the Saviour" the following: "Concerning these (he says) expressly hath spoken the Saviour, that narrow and straitened is the way that leadeth into life, and few are they that fare in into it; broad though and wide the way that leads unto destruction, and many are they that fare through it." The doctrine of the "Two Ways" was a favorite of antiquity, but no nobler interpretation than this has yet been found. It must not be supposed that the use of the term "The Saviour" (ὁ Σωτήρ) presupposes the Gospel or Christianity. The term is not a New Testament favorite, occurring (save in Luke i. 47, ii. 11, Acts v. 31, xiii. 23) only in the so-called later Scriptures (19 times, 6 times in Titus); it has been shut out, then, from the Gospel tradition, perhaps as a current heathen designation of gods or even kings. With the Gnostics it was greatly preferred, while the Fathers substitute for it the name Lord Κύριος, *Domínus*. Its Greek use goes back at least to Æschylus and Pindar, and in its technical sense it was pre-Christian. The battle-cry of the Greeks at Cunaxa was "Zeus Σωτήρ καὶ Νίκη" (Xen. Anab. I, 8, 16).

Again, the doctrine of judging the tree by its fruits finds large space in the Gospels. Thus Matt. vii. 16, "Do they gather grapes from thorns or figs from thistles?" and Luke vi. 44, "For of thorns they gather not figs, nor of bramble harvest grapes." Here is an excellent answer to the oft-recurring question, which of two or more forms is the original? Plainly, both—and neither. They are variants upon an aphorism repeatedly met with in the classics. Says Plutarch, "We do not expect the vine to bear figs nor the olive clusters." Τὴν ἀμπελον σόκα φέρειν οὐδέξιον οὐδὲ τὴν ἐλαίαν βότρυς. (De Tranquillitate Animi, XIII. (472, F). Ovid, too, 'De Arte Amandi,' l. 747.

*Siquis idem sperat, jacturas poma myricas
Speret, et in medio flumine mella petat.*

"If any hopes this, let him hope tamarisks will bear apples, and let him search for honey in the river's mid."

These classic parallels suggest the important question: How much of the New Testament exists under other form in profane literature? The question has not yet received complete answer, which could hardly fail to prove very illuminative.

From all of the foregoing it appears that we must not judge the New Testament by the same standards we apply to the products of individual genius. It is the life of ages and of whole peoples that is concentrated in that volume. It is the gradual precipitate of the moral, religious, and philosophic consciousness of three and a half centuries—a time and two times and the dividing of a time—that is stratified in that wonderful book. To this slow deposit nearly the whole circum-mediterranean region would seem to have made contribution. Certain it is that Rome and Athens and Ephesus and Antioch and Alexandria will bear honorable men-

tion by the side of Palestine and Jerusalem, not yet to include Persia and India.¹ It is the mighty Mother, it is Universal Humanity, that has brought forth this prodigious birth through the long travail of a third of a millennium.

The new aspect under which the critical problem now appears, effects a remarkable transvaluation of values. The great critical movement may be said to have begun, ineffectually to be sure, in the great year 1792 with *The Dissidence of the four generally received Evangelists, and the evidence of their respective authenticity examined*. By Edward Evanson, A.M.—Ipswich. Evanson was bold enough to reject Matthew, Mark, and John, along with many of the Epistles, for reasons never sound but not always unworthy of serious attention. Of course, he held the spurious Scriptures to be later in origin. In 1820 'Probabilia de Evangelii et Epistolarum Joannis, Apostoli, indole et origine eruditorum judicis modeste subiecit Carolus Theoph. Bretschneider.' The author concludes at the end of 224 well-reasoned pages that the fourth Evangelist was "certainly neither John the Apostle, nor a companion of Jesus, nor a Christian sprung from Palestine and living there, nor a born Jew, but some other Christian skilled in Alexandrine doctrine, a presbyter (as he himself professes in later epistles), who in writing it (exarando) made use of both tradition and a written book. Most probably he lived in Egypt

." The author, who so modestly submitted this book to the judgment of the learned, afterwards still more timidly recanted; nevertheless it brought "eternal honor to his name." His arguments were repeatedly answered in detail, hardly in their entirety. But before and beside these two negative judgments as to the sources, there had spread itself an all-embracing skepticism anent the miraculous contents of the New Testament story. In the hands of the English Deists it took the form of mere mockery, of contemptuous denial or disproof, with little or no attempt to understand them genetically, and beyond this stage it has in many cases not advanced even to this day. But the tenderer, more sympathetic, German spirit sought earnestly to interpret the miraculous narratives, to show how they arose, to make clear what forms of religious consciousness had produced them. In this striving there was a possible basis for a steadily progressive intelligent critique and ultimate understanding of the New Testament, while in the brutal English negation there was none.

This German Rationalism had not gone to such alarming lengths without deadly violence no less to the spirit than to the letter of the sacred narratives, but it had been so insidious as to have remained almost unconscious of itself. It was Strauss who in his 'Leben Jesu kritisch untersucht' (1835) rather roughly tore away the mask and showed the "very Age and Bodie of the Time, his forme and pressure." But the

¹For Persia the monumental work of *Cumont* is fundamental and exhaustive. Leaving aside the surmises and parallels of *Seydel* and *Hopkins* ("Christ in India," in his 'India Old and New,' 1901), compare the circumspect dissertation of *Van den Bergh van Eysinga*, 'Indische invloeden op oude Christelijke verhalen' (1901), and articles by *Oldenberg* in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* and the *Deutsche Rundschau*. See Edmunds' "Buddhist and Christian Gospels" (1905).

criticism of Strauss touched almost solely the contents of the Gospels, the profounder question of the sources it did hardly moot. Hence there was not only place but imperative call for Baur and the Tübingen School, with whom New Testament criticism in the more modern sense may be said to have begun.

The influence of their penetrating researches was clearly seen a generation later in Strauss's second 'Life of Jesus for the German People' (1864), less so in the brilliant romance of Renan, ('La Vie de Jésus,') in which keen sympathy, lively fancy, and perfect style vainly strove to supply the place of exact scientific criticism. Meantime another great voice in theology, Albrecht Ritschl's, had in his 'Entstehung der alkatholischen Kirche' (1857) openly renounced the Baurian two-term formula, Paulinism *versus* Petrinism, as unequal to the expression of the facts of early Christianity, and had founded the Ritschlian School, whose leaf even in the fifth decade is still green.

Practically all of this high argument, stretching through 70 years, has turned upon questions of date and authorship. The gravamen of the Tübingen contention consisted in referring the bulk of the New Testament to the second century and construing it as pseudographic and in some sense born of the Paul-Petrine controversy, reflecting it, or solving it, or smoothing it away. On the other hand, the Conservatives, largely aided by Ritschlians, held more or less firmly to the traditionary first century dates and authorship and minimized the antagonism between Jewish and Gentile Christianity.

All this has now been greatly changed. Dates and authors are not indeed unimportant, but they are no longer of prime significance. This follows at once from the principles already enunciated. If these much-debated compositions be really so highly compounded, then their dates and authors are not precisely determinable. Even if it were possible to discover the ultimate or the penultimate reviser, the question would remain as to the extent of his own contribution to the final whole: the fact that he wrote 150 A.D. might very well consist with the fact that some or most of his material appeared even in written form 150 B.C. Thus the units of the New Testament compound seem dissolving under our hands like an atom of radium, but without apparent loss of energy. With this regard the large enterprises of such as Volkmar and Zahn and Hilgenfeld are alike turned awry. At the same time, from this higher view point we can see the partial justification of opposing theories, the half-truth in each term of the contradiction. Radicalism has been right in detecting indications of late origin in many or all of these canonic Scriptures; Conservatism has been equally right in emphasizing the presence of more far older elements. But neither the one nor the other has been justified in any inference from one part to its neighboring part, much less to the whole. Side by side in the faulted and folded strata of a mountain range we may find fossils separated by many thousands of years. Though the apocalyptic prophecies of Mark xiii. be written before the catastrophe of Jerusalem, nothing follows as to the rest of the Gospel, which may have been written much later. Why

may they not have been written, at least in part, a hundred years earlier? They are not foretelling a *second* coming, but only *The Coming* of the Son of Man. Again, even if part of the parallels in Matthew and Luke do presuppose that catastrophe, which quivers still here and there in Matthew (Harnack, Chron., p. 654), it remains none the less true that these vivid pencilings may be only later touches of a revising hand. The body of the picture may still be generations older. In studying these Scriptures we are exploring the tossed ruins of a world, and each fragment must stand on its own merits. Questions then of age and authorship must still present themselves continually, but not under the old familiar forms.

There are two elements in the New Testament that are especially subject to considerations like the preceding: the philosophic, or rather theosophic,¹ and the gnomic. These are present in large measure, even in portions mainly personal and narrative. With respect to both it seems reasonably certain that the age is often very great. The theosophic doctrines repeat themselves under endlessly varying forms in Gnosticism. This latter phenomenon is now referred with increasing positiveness and definiteness to the first Christian and even pre-Christian century. Its wide-reaching roots stretch themselves away back into the alluvium of the Tigris and the Euphrates (see Anz, 'Ursprung des Gnostizismus'). As an offshoot or outgrowth or "acute secularization" (Harnack, D. G. I. 232) of Christianity, it is wholly inconceivable. The great historian of dogma himself annuls his own contention by recognizing a boundless extent of *Vorstufen* (op. cit., p. 226, 231 f.) for his secularization. These prestiges were confessedly pre-Christian, or at the very latest syn-Christian, and since they contained demonstrably and indisputably in this form or in that nearly the whole body of New Testament theosophism and much more, it follows irresistibly that the derivation of Gnosticism from Christianity is in every sense impossible. The two historical products were practically synchronous; since many of the Gnostic central thoughts were certainly centuries pre-Christian, it may be possible to regard Christianity as emerging from Gnosticism, but it is surely impossible any longer to regard Gnosticism as diverging from Christianity. To this general state of case there is explicit testimony in the book of Acts in chapter viii. 9-24, where Simon Magus is represented as an elder contemporary of Peter and Philip. The first preaching of the Gospel in Samaria found him already pre-occupying the ground, for many years he had been amazing the Samaritans, proclaiming some doctrine about the "Power of God, that called Mighty," which we know to be a Gnostic slogan. Now this Simon figures in the Fathers as the wellhead of Gnostic heresy; and it was both the habit and the dogmatic necessity of the Fathers to post-date, never to pre-date, the Heresies. Harnack admits the historicity and antiquity as well as the epic grandeur of Simon's attempt at universal religion. Strangely he regards this heresiarch, who had at the first preaching of the Cross for a "long time" been so omnipotent among the

¹ But we speak divine wisdom (Θεοῦ σοφίαν) in mystery, 1 Cor. ii. 7.

Samaritans as to be considered by them a god — this precursor of Peter he regards as a "counterpart to Jesus" (Gegenbild zu Jesus). That Simonism was the elder is clearly indicated in Acts viii. 13, where Simon accepts the preaching of the Gospel, believes, is baptized, and attaches himself devotedly to Philip (προσκαρτερῶν τῷ Φίλιππῳ). The close affinity of Simon's preaching with Peter's is unmistakably hinted in the disclaimer of Peter (viii. 21), "There is not for thee part or lot in this *Word*." Moreover, we know from Origen (C. Cels. V., 62) that *Simonians* was, at least with the Gentiles, one of many names for Christians. This is not nearly all, however. We learn from Hippolytus that Simon was far from being the fountain-source of Gnostic heresy, at least of Gnosticism. He appears as only fifth in the chronological list. The first, antedating Gnosticism itself, and only later called Gnostics, are the all-important Naassenes, whence all the rest (Hipp. Phil. v. 6). Compared with Naassenism, Simonism is visibly and palpably a much later development. Hence Naassenism is thrown back beyond the beginning of our era. There is no evading this argument *a fortiori*; witness the utter bewilderment of Bunsen in his Tabulation ('Hippolytus and his Age,' I., p. 236), where he says the Gnostics (Hipp's I-IV.) originated 70-99 A.D., but the later Simon belonged to the first age (27 to 65)!! With this early dating, and only therewith, do all the phenomena correspond. Now in this archaic pregnosticism we find already present, however inchoate, a goodly company of the most important and characteristic New Testament ideas: the Son of Man (Humanity = bar-nasha), the Man from Heaven, Citizen of Heaven, the Father, the new Jerusalem, the Choices, the Psychics, the Pneumatics, the Captives (Luke iv. 18; Rom. vii. 23), the Called, the Chosen, the Perfect, the Spirit, the new Birth, the Christ, the Jesus — all of these and more march in proud procession through the pages of Naassenism. The name *Jesus* for the Son of God is used in one of their hymns, which we have no reason for supposing post-Christian, which Harnack and Preuschen declare to be "ein naassenischer jedenfalls alter Psalm" ('Die Ueberlieferung und der Bestand der altchristlichen Litteratur,' p. 168).

The momentous fact confirmatory is that all these notions are used in the New Testament as perfectly familiar, needing no explanation. This presupposes that these notions already had a history lying behind them. We may be perfectly sure that they had been formed and defined and handled about in frequent discussion long before they became encysted in apophthegms of the earliest Christian literature.

With respect to the gnomic element the case is quite as strong. The starry words of the New Testament are evidently stones that have been polished to perfection by the attrition of ages. That this literary peculiarity is due to the personality of Jesus can not be maintained. For since he must have spoken in Aramæan, not in Greek, the forms we have could be only translations. As reproducing words actually used by him, the renderings of Dalman and others have little value. Jesus and the Baptist are thought of as strongly contrasted, almost antipodal; but the style of the one is hardly

distinguishable from the style of the other. Both denounce the Pharisees as "generations of vipers" (Matt. iii. 7, xxiii. 33), both use precisely the same words about the Tree and the Fire (Matt. iii. 10, vii. 19). The variations found in the synoptic reports are precisely what might be expected in such anthologies. Let any one compare corresponding proverbs in sister languages or even different forms in the same language, for example, as given in Bartlett's 'Dictionary of Quotations,' and he will find almost exactly the same phenomena presented.

At this point the recent papyrus finds, with their new 'Sayings of (the) Jesus,' are of striking interest.¹ Clearly they are but *disjecta membra* of a once imposing organism. Such Logoi (not Logia) undoubtedly existed in that elder day in countless number. Oblivion has swallowed them up, as it has swallowed up so much of ancient literature. Here and there some few have escaped and are seen *rari nantes in gurgite vasto*. The salvage of our canonic is like the Seven Tragedies of Sophocles — 7 out of 80! We may rejoice, however, in the belief that what has survived is the best — not all of it the best, nor all of the best, — but on the whole the most worth saving. The Christian consciousness has sifted and resifted, has tested the spirits whether they be of God; it has polished and refined, has set and reset the precious stones, until the great citadel of its faith gleams and flashes like the bejeweled gates of the New Jerusalem.

Examples of the long-continued process of perfectionment lie open to behold in our Gospels. Thus, in Luke vi. 17 the Jesus descends into a plain and teaches a great multitude eagerly pressing upon him. But in Matt. v. 1 he withdraws from the multitude into "the mountain" (of new legislation) and teaches "the disciples" only. In Luke vi. 20 he declares, "Blessed the poor, for *yours* is the kingdom of God"; but in Matt., "Blessed the poor in *spirit*, for theirs is the kingdom of the heavens." In Luke, "Blessed they that hunger now, for *ye* shall be filled"; but in Matt., "Blessed they that hunger and thirst for *righteousness*, for they shall be filled." In Luke, "Blessed they that weep now, for *ye* shall laugh"; but Matt., "Blessed they that mourn, for they shall be comforted." So, too, Matthew omits the "Woes" in Luke, supplying other beautiful beatitudes. That the Lucan form is older and has been immensely spiritualized in Matthew is too plain for argument, though it is not affirmed and not probable that Matthew has derived directly from Luke. Notice, too, that "they that mourn," "the meek shall inherit the earth," "they that thirst," "the pure in heart" are all Old Testament gems (Is. lxi. 2, Ps. xxxvii. 11, Is. lv. 1, Jer. xxxi. 24, Ps. xxiv. 3, 4) gathered into a new brilliant. Compare also Ps. cix. 28, cxxvi. 5, 6 for the Lucan contrasts of weeping and laughing, cursing and blessing.

The primary form of the angelic song (L. ii. 14), it is now admitted, was: "Glory on high to God, and on earth peace among men of (His) good will." that is, His people Israel. Surely it is not hard to forgive the scribe who, by the omission of a single letter, σ, of the last

¹ The formula "(The) Jesus says" seems to stand on precisely the same footing as the Old Testament parallels, "Thus saith Jehovah," and the like. Against Soltau.

word, transformed it into "Glory on high to God, and on earth peace, among men good will."

Once more, the zenith of moral sublimity, before which Rousseau justly exclaimed, "Socrates died like a philosopher but Jesus like a God," is attained in the prayer on the cross: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." Nevertheless, it is now bracketed by Lachmann and Westcott and Hort as a "Western" interpolation. Finally, mark how the Lord's Prayer as given in Luke (xi. 2-4) has been expanded and ennobled in Matthew (vi. 9-13).

Such examples, which may be multiplied indefinitely, may teach us how erroneous it is to suppose that the extra-canonic "Sayings" are less primitive, because less perfect in form and substance; on the contrary, their comparative crudity far more reasonably argues their comparative originality; "first blade, then ear, then full corn in the ear" (Mark iv. 28).

We come now still nearer the heart of the matter. In most of the foregoing we may hope for the general concurrence of critics, save such as Nösgen of Rostock. Few of the enlightened would now deny that the general mind of "the Church" has been largely formative of our present Scriptures. The more advanced would concede that it has even taken an active part in shaping the canonical "Biographies" of Jesus. The recent powerful and convincing work of Wrede admits no doubt on this point. Hear some of his emphasized conclusions: "To write a Life of Jesus meant for Mark not to report something about Jesus, it meant rather quite simply to narrate a life full of Messianic manifestations" ("Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien," 1901, p. 125.) Again, p. 129: "The evangelic research of to-day proceeds throughout on the supposition that Mark in his historical narrative has the actual circumstances of the life of Jesus before his eyes, approximately distinctly, if not uninterruptedly. It presumes that he thinks outward from the Life of Jesus, that he motivates the individual features of his history according to the real circumstances of this life, according to the real thoughts and feelings of Jesus, that he concatenates in historic-psychologic sense the events that he sketches. In accord herewith it interprets, and in accord herewith it criticises the Gospel in detail. It assumes, to be sure, chronologic displacements, inaccuracies as to fact, alterations in the verbiage of utterances ascribed to Jesus, also an addendum of later dogmatic conception. But yet it operates everywhere with the psychologic necessities and probabilities that held for the personal actors in the given situations, it motivates in accordance therewith, it supplements the accounts with the consequences that flow therefrom naturally, and so covers with flesh the skeleton of dry dates. *This view and this procedure must be recognized as false in principle.* It must be said openly: *Mark has no longer any conception (Anschauung) of the historical Life of Jesus.*"

This is certainly one of the very most important deliverances of recent criticism. The characterization of the prevailing investigation of the Gospels is perfect, but it is unfortunate that Wrede has contented himself with a bare negation, however unshakably established.

"Herewith I will by no means prejudge the historic character of the materials, which I have not investigated. These materials may here be disregarded entirely" (p. 129). The same prevalent attitude has been clearly stated by Pfeiderer, though in much broader outline, when he declares with Strauss (against Ullmann) "the Christ of the Gospels is a creation of the faith of the church, but this faith an effect of the person of the historical Jesus." . . . "Historical science, which is concerned to understand Jesus as the originating source of Christianity," Harnack, while strenuously maximizing the trustworthiness of the Gospels in *der Hauptsache*, admits that, "however, here and there are mirrored even in them the conditions of the original community and the experiences through which it passed in later times" (p. 15). In other words, the later apostolic Christian consciousness transfigured more or less the primitive "Life of Jesus." Harnack would perhaps use still stronger language after reading Wrede. So we might go on quoting Feine, Bousset, Weiss, Keim, Jülicher, Holtzmann, Weizsäcker, Gunkel, Meinhold, and the rest. Enough. The transforming activity of the early Christian consciousness they do not deny; how high it is to be rated is yet unsettled; but after Wrede's work it will never again be rated so low as before.

Nevertheless, all these critics up to this time are harmonious on one point, however discordant as to others; they will all agree with their great spokesman, Pfeiderer, that the end and aim of the historical science of the New Testament "is to understand Jesus as the originating source of Christianity." How seriously historical science has taken this problem is above all evident in the great number of works, by men of first-class ability and intensely in earnest, bearing the title *Life of Jesus* or *Life of Christ*. 'Das Leben Jesu' was the title of the great apocalypse of David Friedrich Strauss. Since then we have had Renan's, and Keim's, and Weiss's, and Hase's, and Holtzmann's, and Réville's, and the like, not to mention Farrar's, and Geikie's, and Edersheim's. Even Volkmar, who, in his 'Marcus,' had, along with Hoekstra and Loman, broken the path since trodden by Wrede, resolving so much of the biography into symbolism, *Lehrgedichte*, and the like, even Volkmar must yet write his *Jesus Nazarenus*, sounding often like a recantation.¹ More than one of these works was of signal ability. Keim's was pre-eminently able. But even where no formal 'Life' was written, if the writer attempted any construction or interpretation of primitive Christianity, it was uniformly in terms of the Personality of Jesus. The consciousness of the Christ—that was the oldest Christianity, and, barring the acknowledged imperfection of the means and agents of transmission, that was the content of the Gospel as to us transmitted.

Here at least there is nothing in debate. Surely the problem has been clearly and definitely conceived; it has been firmly and reso-

¹ A like remarkable refluence of critical consciousness made itself known in Loman, the Tiresias of the North, especially in controversy with Scholten. These keen critics, beside whom must be named their unhappy master, Bruno Bauer, had strange forebodings, extraordinary glimpses of the truth—they saw visions, they dreamed dreams. But their glittering structures lacked the solid foundation of scientific fact. No wonder then that they have sunk in a heap.

lutely grasped; the materials for solution are not lacking in abundance; the expenditure of the widest, deepest, exactest learning, of zeal and abilities of the highest order, has been prodigal, and the methods employed have been infinitely varied;— what then, we may and we must ask, has been the net result? The answer can not be doubtful, absolutely *nil!* There is no exaggeration in this statement. Thus far it has been found utterly impossible to rationalize the Life of Jesus. Certain negative critical results have obtained more or less general recognition in critical circles, but they do not, however sure apparently, help us in the least “to understand Jesus as the originating source of Christianity.” On the contrary, they tend rather to make such understanding less and less possible. The theories developed in such capital works as Pfeleiderer’s ‘Das Urchristenthum,’ or Harnack’s ‘Das Wesen des Christentums,’ or Henrici’s ‘Das Urchristenthum,’ or Réville’s ‘Jésus de Nazareth,’ or McGiffert’s ‘The Apostolic Age,’ or the cognate treatises of Schürer, Hausrath, Weizsäcker, Votaw, and others, though lasting monuments of erudition, though brimful of ingenuity and sagacity, though widely illuminative and always pressing out further and further the bounds of our knowledge— all such are none the less disappointing as regards the capital point. In the last resort they are all equally impotent to make the Christian movement comprehensible or credible as an emanation from a personal focus, as a reaction from the Life and Death of the Man Christ Jesus. We might illustrate this fact by abundant citation, but there is no need to carry owls to Athens. Not one but must in the end beg the whole question, must abdicate the whole task, by assuming some uniqueness in this Personality, some absolute disparate-ness and incomparability with all other humanity. In other words, when under their inexorable analysis every trace of the miraculous¹ has vanished alike from Gospels and Acts, from Epistles and Apocalypse, there remains unshaken in tremendous majesty the one supreme Miracle of Miracles, the Heart of Heart in the New Testament, without Whom all other miracles are vain and contradictory, with Whom they acquire consistency and awful significance. The crumbling away of these outer parapets but lifts aloft into still bolder relief the impregnable strength of this inmost citadel.

The case then stands thus:

If Jesus be such a unique Personality as everywhere demanded by critical theory, in last analysis incomparable with the sons of men, then He was in some sense superhuman, it makes no difference in what sense, and neither His words nor His deeds are to be measured by the standard of men. Hence His miracles, one and all, remain miracles but cease to be wonders. We know of no reason why He should not have been born of a virgin, and walked on the waves, and raised the dead, and ascended into heaven, and endowed His disciples with any desirable spiritual gifts, and transmitted the Power of the Keys to an endless series

¹ Even criticism in the bosom of the Church of England spares now but two or at most but four of the miracles: The Incarnation and the Resurrection, with their “incidents,” the virgin Birth and the Ascension. See the recent controversy in ‘The Nineteenth Century and After.’

of infallible vicegerents. Nay, it becomes antecedently highly probable that He would and did do all this and much more; we should reasonably expect such a unique extra-natural being to do unique extra-natural things. We have no ground at all, then, for extruding or slurring or minimizing the non-natural element in the Scriptures, but every ground for retaining and accenting and even magnifying it. Accordingly, the strictly orthodox view appears alone consistent and rational, the liberal theology must ultimately commit suicide, however skilfully it may postpone the denouement to the last page of the last chapter. The unescapable question, “What think ye of the Christ?” must sooner or later precipitate the catastrophe. Greatly then as we admire and applaud the most enlightened scholarship of Europe and America, we must admit that at this critical pivotal point it has no standing before the bar of logic. This year-and-nay criticism has now for years been bankrupt.

When so many wingéd hounds of Zeus thus find that their quarry forever eludes them, the suggestion is inevitable that there is something radically wrong in their method of pursuit, that in some way their finest sense has betrayed them. We hold that the nature of their error is now at length an open secret. They have sought to explain Christianity as an emanation from a single individual human focus, as the reaction upon history and environment of a single human personality, they have sought “to understand Jesus as the originating source of Christianity”— they have failed and they must forever fail: for no such explanation is possible, because no such origination was real. Over against all such attempts we oppose the fact that every day comes to clearer and clearer light, that now flashes continually into evidence around the whole horizon of investigation, the fact that was perceived nearly a decade ago, but whose effective proclamation called for the publication of a series of preparatory investigations, the fact that the Genesis of Christianity must be sought in the collective consciousness of the first Christian and immediately pre-Christian centuries, that in the Syncretism of that epoch of the amalgamation of faiths, when all the currents of philosophic and theosophic thought dashed together their waters in the vast basin of the Roman circummediterranean empire, was to be sought and found the possibility and the actuality of a new faith of Universal Humanity, that should contain something appealing to the head and the heart of all men, from slave to emperor, a faith in which there should be no longer male and female, Jew and Greek, bond and free, but all should be one by virtue of a common Humanity, of the ageless, timeless, spaceless Son of Man.² It is as the outcome of this Syncretism, as the final efflorescence of the Judæo-Greco-Roman Spirit, of the Asiatic-European Soul, that Christianity is wholly intelligible and infinitely significant; the notion that it is an individual Palestinian product is the *Carthago delenda* of New Testament criticism.

That the drift of the most advancing thought and the most penetrating research is all in the direction indicated, can not escape the notice of the reader of the most recent

² ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου = Bar-nasha = Human Being.

works of such as Pfeleiderer, Gunkel, Bousset, Zimmern, Heitmüller, Dieterich, Sceberg, Wrede, Kreyenbühl, Usener, and their peers. Such is the unmistakable trend of historico-religious investigation. But this latter is very slow, and naturally very slow, to cut loose from the ancient moorings, to weigh anchor and commit itself to seas entirely unknown. Thus even Gunkel hesitated long ("nach langem Zaudern und manchen Erwägungen") before publishing his 'Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments' (1903). He has therein spoken out bravely the great word (p. 95), "Christianity is a syncretic religion," even as Bousset had already declared: "Judaism, however, was the retort in which the different elements were assembled" (Rel. d. Judentums, p. 493).¹ Nevertheless, Gunkel tells us "all this has been transferred to Jesus," "When then Jesus appeared in his superhuman sublimity," and it avails little to add "that the christologic problem of the present is not merely historic and can not be solved in purely historical way"; so that, after all, we are advanced hardly an inch beyond the elder standpoint. In the same spirit Wernle declares that "Paul's utterance concerning Jesus was at bottom a myth, a drama, to which Jesus gave the name" (329). None the less, Wernle still deduces Christianity from this uniquely but merely human Jesus.

The amazing state of case, then, is this: The most piercing criticism detects nearly the whole body of Christian doctrine and practice in the mixed religions of the day, even the sacraments themselves. None of this, it feels sure, "can be derived from the teaching of Jesus; they show us how Christianity in its infancy was drawn into the chaos of Oriental religions" (Wernle). Nevertheless, it assures us that this teaching, *this* Jesus, remains the heart's core of Christianity. When now we ask, what then was this teaching, what this Personality? the answer rendered is arbitrariness itself. Since the critic feels constrained to explain 99 per cent of Christian theory and practice as derived from Judæo-pagan sources, as merely "transferred to Jesus," he is at liberty to choose the remaining 1 per cent as he will; he makes of the teaching precisely what he thinks it ought to have been, he declares Jesus did or did not teach this or that, because it conforms or does not conform to his idea of Jesus! But whence this idea? Certainly not from the Gospels, for these are saturated through and through with "transferred" elements; the only one that professes to be based on personal knowledge, the Fourth, is exactly the one that is rejected *in toto* as history, even by such a conservative critic as Harnack ("Especially the Fourth Gospel . . . can not be used as an historic source in the ordinary sense of the word" — D. W. d. C., p. 13)! No standard, then, is left but the caprice of the critic; he makes his own Jesus and conforms the Gospel thereto! If the Gospel contains contradictory or superfluous elements, they have been imported from the surrounding "chaos"! If it omits certain necessary or desirable features, it was because the religious consciousness of the writers was not free to assimilate them, but was bound fast by the his-

torical conditions that obtained! It is plain at a glance that nothing can ever come of such criticism, where the "poverty of the ascertained historical materials" is turned into endless imaginary wealth by "the uncontrolled power of combination and divination" (Pfeleiderer). The focus, the burning point of investigation, must then be this *Personality*, which is thus the irresolvable residuum of the most inexorable analysis. But we may be absolutely sure that nothing can ever come of the arbitrary methods in vogue, all of whose airy constructions of the "Nazarene"

Are but dust that rises up
And is lightly laid again.

Against every such theory of a unique deified Man, *still more* against the recent crudities of Kalthoff (Jesus merely a social-ethical Ideal!), while expressly holding important collateral questions in abeyance, it seems that criticism must now *explicitly postulate the aboriginal Godhood of the Centre of Christianity*, as appears at least from these considerations:

1. *The mere human Personality, which each critic postulates according to his own convenience, makes no great figure in the early propaganda.* Neither in the book of Acts, nor in the Epistles, nor in the oldest extra-canonic literature, can the keenest eye detect the after-effect of "the Carpenter," his words, his deeds, his life, his death: the Jesus, the Christ is everywhere conspicuous, towering like the Matterhorn, but everywhere supremely as an object of worship, as an over-earthly supernal Being, as a *God* ("The Outlook," 66, p. 686 f., 1900). The greatest early preacher, the Apostle, apparently cared little or naught for the earthly history of Jesus, and preached Him solely as a Divinity. When Harnack and the rest talk of "the impression that he made upon his disciples and which they propagated," they forget the Pauline injunction not to be wise above what is written. Certainly, any such human Person as they assume must have made and left a regulative, overpowering, and ineffaceable impression; the fact then that no such impression at all is anywhere discernible, but quite the contrary, must teach us to revise their assumptions.

2. *The preaching of "the Jesus" was seemingly pre-Christian.* We have already mentioned the occurrence of the name and the idea in "an ancient psalm of the Naassenes" (Harnack), which we have no right to regard as post-Christian. It also occurs repeatedly, at least four times, in the 'Zauberpapyri' lately brought to light, especially at line 3120 of the great Paris Papyrus edited by C. Wessely, in a long "Hebraic Logos" which shows no trace of Christian influence, which is expressly attributed to "the pure men," and which the great master, Dieterich, positively ascribes to the (pre-Christian) Essenes. At line 3119-20 we read

ὀρκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν Ἑβραίων

Ἰησοῦ "I adjure thee by the God of the Hebrews, Jesus."

As the end of controversy on this point we cite Acts xviii. 25, where of the learned and eloquent and zealous Apollon of Alexandria it is said, "He was wont to speak and teach accurately the doctrine of the Jesus (*ἔλαλει καὶ ἐδίδασκεν ἀκριβῶς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*), *knowing only the baptism of John.*" The phrase italicized excludes

¹ Most characteristically Bousset adds: "Then resulted through a creative miracle the new formation of the Gospel."

all possibility of biographical reference to the Jesus of the Gospels, and shows incontestably that *the cult of the Jesus* was fervently propagated far and wide in ignorance of the earthly Life of Jesus.

3. The Epithet "Nazorean" (*Ναζαρητιος, Ναζαρητιος, Ναζωρητιος, Ναζωρητιος*) is *not* derived from Nazareth, a seeming topographic fancy, but is a divine appellative derived from the Old-Semitic stem NaṢar, meaning to *keep, guard, preserve*, frequent in the cuneiform inscriptions (na-ṣa-ru) as far back as 2250 B.C., constant in the Old Testament, where *Nōsrīm* means *watchers*, precisely the term by which the Talmud designated the Christians (NaZoReans). The epithet Nazorean would mean then *Servator*, almost the same as *Salvator* (Jesus), which are both used to render the Greek *Σωτηρ*. The Syriac form Naṣaryā suggests, but does not prove decisively, that the termination refers to the divine name Yah. So that Naṣaryā would mean *Servator—Yah*. (See 'The Monist,' January 1905, pp. 25-45.)

4. The "Nasaraioi" were certainly "before Christ" and "knew not Christ," to quote Epiphanius (Pan. Haer. xxix. 6). The name is the same as Naṣaryā (Syriac for Nazarene) and indicates that they worshipped God (Yah) under a particular aspect or *Person*, namely, as Protector, Preserver (N—S—R). The notions of Servator (*Νασαρ—αιος*) and Salvator (*Ἰησους*,) being hardly distinguishable, we naturally get the double title Jesus Nazarean. The fusion of this notion of *Saviour* with the more orthodox notion of *Messiah* (*Chrestos*)¹ gave rise to the slogan of Paulinism, *the Jesus—the Christ*; this fusion was perhaps distinctively the work of Paul.

5. *Primitive Christianity seems not unifocal but multifocal in origin and development.* It does not emerge full-fledged at Jerusalem and encompass the Mediterranean with the flight of an eagle. The "astoundingly swift" (Heinrici) spread of the Gospel seems only apparent. In reality it seems everywhere in the air, a divine contagion. It springs up almost simultaneously in Jerusalem, in Antioch, in Damascus, in Alexandria, in Rome, in Crete, in Libya, in Ephesus, in Corinth²—wherever in the Dispersion the seed was sown. The book of Acts makes two attempts to explain this multifocal fact in accord with its own unifocal theory. It assembles at Pentecost "in Jerusalem, dwellers, Jews, devout men from every nation that is under heaven," who, "each one in his own dialect, heard them (the Apostles) speaking." The other is found in the mighty persecution that arose against the Church in Jerusalem after Stephanos was *crowned* with martyrdom. "All were dispersed except the Apostles." But these were really the only or at least the principal offenders, the very ones that would have been dispersed first of all. Immediately after, the Church had peace, was builded up and multiplied (Acts ix. 31), and, not many years after, the believers in Jerusalem number many myriads, all zealous for the law (Acts xxi. 20). The fact of multi-

licity is clearly implied in these abortive attempts to trace it back to a higher unity. The other evidences are strewn through the book of Acts; they are scattered and broken lights, but gathered up and focused by the lens of criticism they glow with surprising brightness.

So far the investigation has been carefully made, and so much appears "very probable." Still other kindred inquiries are in progress, but of these the results must be awaited. Enough, however, seems established to show that the "hopeless confusion" of Rationalism, in its century-old essay to interpret Christianity from the *Man* Christ Jesus as the assumed sole human personal animating centre, must remain forever confused and hopeless, for no such interpretation can ever be correct. On the contrary, this most interesting and most important of all historic phenomena is comprehensible and must be comprehended as a total product of the totality of historic-religious-philosophic-ethic conditions prevailing around the Mediterranean, as a phenomenon which itself came not with observation, so that no man could say "Lo here!" or "Lo there!" but which emerged to view from the fermentation of three centuries and lightened like the dawn of a polar day round the whole horizon from the East even unto the West. This prodigy, this heir of all the ages, appeared at first under many forms, with many slogans and battle-cries, of very varying degrees of worth. It was the work especially of the second century to rally the straggling and sometimes contending arrays under one banner, to select and unify and communicate what was best in each, and to reject and excommunicate what was bad or irreconcilable. The organic result was the Old Catholic Church,—as its name implies, the *totalization* of a host of originally more or less independent elements. Here, however, we are brought to the borderland of theology, and here we must pause, for that border we dare not cross. Many important consequences seem to present themselves naturally, but these must be left for the reader to recognize. If the deep-eddying stream of criticism, whose swift descent we have followed through the century, has now at last surmounted and surpassed every bulwark of tradition, we need only reflect that it is a cleansing and a fertilizing flood, the river of the waters of life, that has been poured abroad over exhausted fields, and that the inundated plains will blossom and brighten anew with abundant blessing.

Bibliography.—Aall, 'Der Logos' (1896-9); Baldensperger, 'Die messianisch-apokalyptischen Hoffnungen des Judentums' (1903); Blass, 'Acta Apostolorum' (1895); Bousset, 'Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament' (1894); Bugge, 'Die Hauptparabeln Jesu' (1903); Clemen, 'Paulus' (1904); Brandt, 'Die Evangelische Geschichte' (1893); Cheyne, 'Bible Problems' (1905); Deissmann, 'Bibelstudien' (1895); Dieterich, 'Abraxas' (1891), 'Nekyia' (1893), 'Eine Mithrasliturgie' (1903); von Dobschütz, 'Probleme des apostolischen Zeitalters' (1904); Drummond, 'An Inquiry, etc., into the Fourth Gospel' (1903); Feine, 'Jesus Christus und Paulus' (1902); Fiebig, 'Altjüdische Gleichnisse und die Gleichnisse Jesu' (1904); Friedländer, 'Der vorchristliche jüdische Gnosticismus' (1898); Gregory, 'Textkritik des Neuen Testaments' (1900); Har-

¹ The earlier form, see Blass *Gram. d. nt. Gr.* § 27.
4. Compare also Ps. xxxiv. 8, quoted by Clem. Alex., *Adm. in Gent.* 56 C. Sylb., taste and see that *Christos* is *God*, where the Septuagint has *Chrestos* (good) is *the Lord*.

² As is proved by microscopic scrutiny of Acts.

nack, 'Die Mission und die Ausbreitung des Christentums' (1902); Hawkins, 'Horæ Synopticae' (1899); Heitmueller, 'Im Namen Jesu' (1903); Hilgenfeld, 'Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums' (1884); Holtzmann, 'Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Theologie' (1897); Jülicher, 'Die Gleichnisreden Jesu' (1899); Kreynbühl, 'Das Evangelium der Wahrheit' (1900); Lietzmann, 'Der Menschensohn' (1896); Lightfoot, 'Biblical Essays' (1893); Loisy, 'L' Évangile et L' Église' (1902), 'Le quatrième Évangile' (1903); Loman, 'Quaestiones Paulinae' (1882-6), 'Nalatenschap' (1899); Van Manen, 'Paulus' (1890); Mayor, 'Epistle of Saint James' (1892); Merx, 'Die vier kanonischen Evangelien' (1897); Nestle, 'Einführung in das griechische Neue Testament' (1899); Pfeiderer, 'Der Paulinismus' (1873); 'Das Christusbild' (1904); Reitzenstein, 'Poimandres' (1904); Schmidt, C., 'Acta Pauli' (1905); Schmidt, N., in 'Encyc. Bibl.'; Schmiedel, 'Winer's Grammatik' (1894), 'Encyc. Bibl.' *passim*; Seeberg, 'Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit' (1903); v. Soden, 'Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments' (1902); Soltau, 'Unsere Evangelien' (1901); Spitta, 'Geschichte und Literatur des Urchristentums' (1893-6-1901); Usener, 'Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen' (1889); Weiss, 'Die Offenbarung Johannis' (1904); Wendland, *Σωτήρ* (in Preuschen's 'Zeitschrift,' 1904); Zahn, 'Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons' (1888). Commentaries: Hand-Kommentar, Meyer's, Zahn's, Schanz's, International Critical, Strack-Zöckler; 'Encyclopædia Biblica' (edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black, 1899); 'Dictionary of the Bible' (edited by J. Hastings and J. A. Selbie, 1898). Introductions: Bacon (1902); Balion (1893); Hilgenfeld (1875); Holtzmann, (1892); Salmon (1885); Trenkle (1897); Weiss (1897); Zahn (1897); Jülicher (1893).

WILLIAM BENJAMIN SMITH,
Tulane University, New Orleans.

New Testament Criticism. Triple Evidence.—Logicians distinguish between metaphysical, physical, and moral evidence for the things we know. Metaphysical evidence is based on the unchangeable essences of objects or on the analysis of our concepts; for example, the whole is greater than its parts. Physical evidence is based on the conditional stability of the laws of nature; for example, the sun rises in the east and sets in the west. Moral evidence is based on the testimony of a witness; it implies that we have the genuine words of the witness, and that the witness is endowed with the necessary knowledge and veracity. The New Testament does not furnish us either metaphysical or physical evidence; we have to be content with moral evidence. And even this is not of the highest order. We do not listen to the words of eye-witnesses, but we have only a number of historical and doctrinal writings to consult. Again, we do not possess a single autograph of these writings; our New Testament text has been copied and copied again, edited and edited again, so that at present not a single verse reads exactly alike in all copies and editions. The very words of our witnesses seem to have become uncertain. Moreover, doubt has been raised as to the knowledge and the veracity of our New Testament writers; their evidence has been pronounced unreliable even in those

passages in which their words are practically certain.

Criticism.—For these reasons the principles of criticism must be applied to the books of the New Testament. Lower or textual criticism will inquire into the genuineness of each verse and of every word of the New Testament. Higher criticism will investigate the authenticity of the entire New Testament books, and will test their reliability. Meanwhile, let not the metaphysician and the scientist underrate the evidence furnished by the New Testament writings. It is the evidence on which history is built; even the abstract thinker is content with this kind of evidence as soon as he leaves the region of speculation and enters into practical life.

Lower or Textual Criticism.—Lower or textual criticism strives to restore the original text of the New Testament. Its method consists generally in a reversal of the process by which false readings have penetrated into the text. The original readings are suggested partly by the ingenuity of the critic, partly by the text of early manuscripts or of patristic quotations or again of early versions.

Original Manuscripts.—The original copies of our New Testament books must have been lost very early. No early Father appeals to the original manuscript in defence of his own peculiar reading of the text. Tertullian (de præscript. 36) and Peter of Alexandria (de pasch. vii.; Migne, P. G. xviii. 517, 520) are no exceptions. Tertullian's words concerning the Pauline Epistles do not necessarily imply the existence of the original copies; and Peter's testimony is based on late authority. Neither can it be said that a fragment of Mark's original Gospel is still kept in Venice (Baron., Annal. ad ann. 485), and that the copy of Matthew's Gospel written by Barnabas is still extant in Constantinople (Assem., Biblioth. orient. ii. pp. 81 ff.); for both relics are spurious.

Early Variations.—Some of the early ecclesiastical writers are of opinion that the New Testament text was corrupted intentionally by the heretics. This view is expressed by Irenæus (c. hæc. i. 27; Migne, P. G. vii. 638), Dionysius of Corinth (Eus., H. E. iv. 23; Migne, P. G. xx. 388 ff.), Tertullian (c. Marc. v., *passim*), Eusebius (H. E. v. 28; Migne, P. G. xx. 516), and Epiphanius (hæc. xlii. 9 ff.; Migne, P. G. xli. 708). We do not deny that heretical writers may have introduced one or another variant, but they cannot be held responsible for the great bulk of different readings. Nor are we at a loss to account for the early appearance of variations. (1) Oral tradition was prized higher in the earliest times of the Church than the written word. (2) The dogma of inspiration was not sufficiently well developed to demand a special amount of accuracy on the part of the copyists. (3) Most copyists did not work as official scribes of the Church, but transcribed the text for the use of private persons. (4) It must also be kept in mind that the scientific accuracy of later days was not a characteristic feature of the first centuries. (5) Finally, the copyists were fallible men, and as such they were not exempt from the various sources of accidental error to which all scribes are subject.

Earliest Witnesses for Variations.—Among the earliest witnesses for the existence of va-

riants in the New Testament text must be reckoned Polycarp, Hegesippus, Papias, the Elders of Irenæus, Justin, Theodotus, the Churches of Vienne and of Lyons, Marcion, Ptolemæus, Heracleon, and Tatian. Nor can the variants, for the existence of which they testify, be regarded as mere accidental slips of memory. Polycarp's quotation of Act. ii. 24 (ad Philipp. i. 2) disagrees with nearly all Greek codices and early versions, but it agrees with cod. D, the Vulgate, and several other versions. The double reading of this passage must then have existed even in his days. Irenæus (adv. hæ. 30. 1; Migne, P. G. vii. 1203) appeals to ancient and accurate manuscripts in defence of a certain reading. Clement of Alexandria, too (Strom. iv. 6; Migne, P. G. vii. 1252), cites variants of certain passages. Various readings must therefore have been quite common in the 2d century. In the 3d century Origen complains of the great diversity in the codices (in Matt. xv. 14; Migne, P. G. xiii. 1293), and during the course of the 3d century Jerome attests that the evil grew rather than diminished (ad Dam., præf. in evang.). After the 4th century the occurrence of variants is attested by existing manuscripts, patristic quotations, and faithful translations.

Incipient Stability.—It has been believed that Origen was the author of a revised text of the New Testament. But this opinion can hardly be reconciled with Origen's own words (in Matt. xv. 14; Migne, P. G. xiii. 1293). On the other hand, many learned men did not consider it below their dignity to aid in the transcription of the sacred text. Eusebius and Jerome (H. E. VI. xxxii. 3; de vir. ill. 75) testify that Pamphilus had transcribed certain texts. Jerome again (ep. 34; al. 141) tells us that the priests Acacius and Euzoius had been engaged in transcribing the sacred text in the library of Cesarea. In other passages Jerome shows his esteem for the manuscripts written by Adamantius and Pierius (in Matt. xxiv. 26; in Gal. iii. 1; Migne, P. L. xxvi. 181, 348), the latter of whom was one of Origen's successors in the presidency of the Alexandrian School; but neither Jerome nor Eusebius can be cited as a witness for a text revision by either of Jerome's favorites (cf. Eus. H. E. vii. 32; Migne, P. G. xx. 732). True text revisions appear to have been edited by the Egyptian bishop Hesychius and the Antiochian priest Lucian. It is true that Jerome's words (ad Dam., præf. in evang.; de vir. ill. 77) are not as clear and definite as one might desire. Still they show that Hesychius and Lucian had paid considerable attention to the problem of the New Testament text. Hug, Eichhorn, and W. Bousset have ventured to suggest that the work of Hesychius has been preserved in the so-called Alexandrian group of New Testament variants, while that of Lucian is variously connected with the Byzantine or the Neutral group. But no proof for either view has thus far been advanced. It cannot be denied, however, that from the 4th or 5th century onward the variants in the New Testament crystallize into several types or forms, differing according to the country in which the respective manuscripts were written, the versions were made, and the citations were employed.

Causes Which Effected the Stable Text Groups.—We have said that the different

groups of variants were more or less attached to their place of origin. But loyalty to the customs of particular places was not the only cause of the incipient text stability. The following considerations will suggest additional reasons: (1) The local ecclesiastical authorities naturally insisted on having the transcriber copy the text current in each particular Church. (2) After the Church began to enjoy the blessings of peace under the reign of Constantine, the bishops had better opportunities to regulate the interior affairs of their respective dioceses (cf. Sozom., H. E. i. 11; Migne, P. G. lxxvii. 889). (3) Owing to Diocletian's decree concerning the destruction of sacred books, many copies of the New Testament had been destroyed during the late persecution, so that the number of the model texts was greatly reduced (Eus., H. E. viii. 2; Migne, P. G. xx. 745). (4) Finally, the Emperor Constantine charged Eusebius with the transcription of 50 new codices which were donated to the various imperial foundations and thus became the model text for innumerable other copies (cf. Eus., Vit. Constant., iv. 34, 36, 37; Migne, P. G. xx. 1181 ff.). Here we have an explanation of the fact that the so-called Syrian or Byzantine group of texts attained such an overwhelming popularity.

The Written Text from the 4th to the 16th Century.—Though from the 4th century onward the particular Churches had their own peculiar groups of variants which they propagated in preference to other readings, it must not be imagined that the lines of demarcation between these text-families are mathematically accurate. Suppose we denote by 1 the text peculiar to the Church A, by 2 that current in the Church B, by 3 that peculiar to the Church C, etc., then the text peculiar to the Church Z will not be entirely new, but in all likelihood it will be a mixture of 1, 2, 3; and the text of the Church Y will be a mixture expressed by 3, 2, 1; and similarly the text of the Church X will be the mixture of 2, 1, 3. And while the codices were thus propagated, fairly faithful reproductions of parts of the text were kept for us by Eusebius, Athanasius, Epiphanius, the two Cyrils, Basil, the two Gregorys, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Ephræm. To these illustrious men must be added Andrew of Cappadocia for the 5th century, Venerable Bede, John Damascene, and Alcuin for the 8th, Photius for the 9th, Suidas and Arethas for the 10th, Theophylactus, Œcumenius, and Euthemius for the 11th and 12th, the Correctoria for the 13th, and Laurentius Valla for the 15th. And this is by no means an exhaustive list of men and works important for textual or lower criticism.

New Testament Codices.—Greek manuscripts are divided into uncials and cursives or minuscules. In uncial writing all the letters are large and divided. The other class of manuscripts is called minuscule, because its letters are small; it is called cursive, because its letters are linked together in a running hand. Broadly speaking, the manuscripts written before the 10th century are uncials; those written between the 10th and the invention of printing (1454 A.D.) are minuscule or cursive. Not counting 8 manuscript psalters containing the text of the hymns found in the third Gospel, the New Testament uncials number 114; 2 of these belong to the 4th century, 15 to the 5th,

24 to the 6th, 17 to the 7th, 19 to the 8th, 31 to the 9th, 6 to the 10th. But only one of all these contains the complete text of the New Testament; 4 others contain the greatest part of it. Besides these 5, there are 81 gospel manuscripts (12 complete or nearly so, 14 partial ones, and 55 fragmentary), 13 of the Book of Acts (5 complete or nearly so, 8 more or less fragmentary), 5 of the Catholic Epistles (4 more or less complete, 1 fragment), 20 of the Pauline Epistles (7 more or less complete, 13 fragmentary). There are 4 complete manuscripts of the Apocalypse, and 1 defective one. Of the cursive manuscripts more than 1,200 contain the Gospels, more than 400 the Book of Acts, more than 500 the Pauline Epistles, more than 180 the Apocalypse. Besides, textual criticism knows more than 260 lectionaries with fragments of the Book of Acts and of the Epistles, and more than 950 evangelistaria, about 100 of which are uncial manuscripts. The investigation into the origin and the relationship of the various cursive manuscripts is far from being complete. To facilitate reference, the uncial manuscripts were denoted by capital letters, either Latin or Greek or even Hebrew, while the cursives were indicated by Arabic figures. H. Fr. von Soden has changed this notation considerably. On the list arranged according to this improved plan, not merely the identity of Soden's 2,328 manuscripts is indicated, but also their age and contents ('Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte'; Bd. 1.).

The Printed Text.—It was in 1516 that Erasmus published the first printed edition of the Greek New Testament text. He based his work on six manuscripts at most; of these none was complete, and only one valuable. New and improved editions of the Erasmusian text were issued in 1519, 1522, 1527, and 1535. Meanwhile, the polyglot edition of Cardinal Ximenes, which had been prepared with much greater care, and had left the press on 10 Jan. 1514, was published in 1522 (perhaps in 1520); but being limited to 600 copies, it never reached a large circulation. Not to mention other reissues of these two main editions, Robert Estienne or Stephanus repeated in his third and fourth editions (1550, 1551) almost the pure Erasmusian text, adding in the margin variants based on 15 manuscripts and the polyglot of Ximenes. The English *Authorized Version* and the so-called *Received Text* current in England follow the third edition of Stephanus. His fourth edition is the first Greek text divided up into verses. Among its numerous re-editors, Th. Beza and the Elzevir Brothers deserve the first rank. The preface of the second Elzevir edition, which appeared in 1633, contains the words "*textum habes nunc ab omnibus receptum.*" Hence the reprints of this text, and there are more than 170, are simply called the *Received Text*. In brief then, the *Received Text* is the text of the second Elzevir edition, which appears to be a repetition of the Bezan text. This latter is the fourth edition of Stephanus corrected according to several notes of Henry Stephanus, some ancient versions, and the Codex Claramontanus. In its turn, the Stephanus edition is a repetition of the fifth Erasmusian edition, and the latter is based on codd. 1 and 2 for the text of the Gospels,

on cod. 4 for the text of Acts, on cod. 7 for the Pauline Epistles, on cod. 1 for the text of the Apocalypse, in such a way, however, that the successive reprints of this highly composite text were slightly emended according to a few other text sources.

Critical Apparatus.—Robert Estienne (c. 1546) and Th. Beza (c. 1565) are rightly considered as the pioneer collectors of an apparatus for the textual criticism of the New Testament. Br. Walton (c. 1657) and John Fell also co-operated at the building up of such an apparatus, but they were far surpassed by Mill (c. 1707), who collected about 30,000 variants out of more than 100 sources. Bengel (1687-1752) first divided the various readings into groups. He distinguished between an African and an Asiatic or Byzantine type of variants. Semler (c. 1740) and Griesbach (1745-1812) distinguished three text groups: the former called his divisions the Alexandrian, the Occidental, and the Oriental or Byzantine family; the latter named his groups the Alexandrian, the Occidental, and the Constantinopolitan. Eichhorn (c. 1820) and Hug (c. 1840) agreed with Griesbach, but Scholz (c. 1850) returned to the double division into Alexandrian and Byzantine readings. Tischendorf (1815-74) acknowledged four different types of text, an Alexandrian, a Latin, an Asiatic, and a Byzantine; Tregelles (1813-75) favored again a dual division of texts, naming them the Constantinopolitan and the Alexandrian group. Finally, Westcott and Hort introduced four text families: the Syrian, the Occidental, the Alexandrian, and the Neutral. The Syrian text is the vulgate text in the Greek Church since the middle of the 4th century. It is supposed to be a revised edition of a pre-Syrian vulgate text. This latter exhibits three peculiarities: one group of its variants is remarkable for paraphrases, interpolations, amplifications, and omissions; this text constitutes the Occidental group. Another group of variants is peculiar for its grammatical and scholastic emendations, and this is called the Alexandrian. A third set of variants, though pre-Syrian, shows neither the diffusiveness of the Occidental text, nor the nicety of the Alexandrian; it is therefore called the Neutral group. Now, since the Syrian text figures as the vulgate of the Greek Church after the middle of the 4th century, and since about a century must be allowed for the rise and passing away of the Occidental and the Alexandrian families, the Neutral type of variants must have been the common text during the course of the 2d century. But it cannot be maintained that these premises and conclusions are admitted by all textual critics.

Critical Editions of the New Testament.—After the *Received Text* had become the current Greek text, it began to be regarded as quite sacred. Mill, Bengel, and Wetstein collected various readings differing from the *Received Text*, but they did not dare to introduce them into the body of the New Testament. It was Griesbach who first changed the *Received Text* according to the authority of various manuscripts; but not even Griesbach had the full courage of his conviction. Besides, he was not acquainted with some of the oldest manuscripts discovered after his time (c. 1777). We need not delay over some of the less important edi-

tions published by Mace, Harwood, Matthæi, Alter, Scholz, Schott, Knapp, Tittmann, Hahn, Theile, and others.

Lachmann (1793-1851) was the first who endeavored to construct a new text out of the oldest manuscripts known to him. Believing it impossible to restore the original text, he tried to reconstruct the readings that had been current in the Church during the course of the 4th century. For this purpose he confined his study to a few of the oldest manuscripts, together with a few of the Fathers, and the best codices of the Latin Vulgate. He simply counted the authorities in favor of each reading, and then followed the majority. Though the text thus prepared is far better than the *Received Text*, it is based on too small a number of witnesses, on too slight a knowledge of the few manuscripts actually used, and on too mechanical a method of using them.

Tischendorf's services in the publication of manuscripts have probably done more to establish textual criticism on a sound basis than anything else. Besides, he published at least 8 (according to another method of reckoning, 21) editions of the New Testament. It is to be regretted that he did not use his material more consistently and scientifically. Between 1821 and 1849 he differs considerably from the *Received Text*; between 1849 and 1869 he approaches quite closely to it; but after 1869 he again diverges from it. His last, or eighth edition (1864-72) still remains the standard collection of evidence for the Greek text. The prolegomena (1884-94) to this edition are the work of Gregory; they give an account of the manuscripts, the versions, and the patristic quotations.

Tregelles (1831-75) published two manuscripts, and collated many others with great accuracy, thus preparing his material for a revised Greek text. He based his edition exclusively on the most ancient authorities, but he used a larger number of them than Lachmann had done. Like his predecessors, he did not follow the principle of grouping in his new edition, so that the choice of his readings depends somewhat on personal preferences. Alford, Lightfoot, Weiss, and others also have devoted a good deal of study to the New Testament text, but more with a view to its proper interpretation than its emendation.

Finally, Westcott and Hort have given us a new edition of the New Testament text based on the principle of grouping as explained under the preceding number. By adhering to the Neutral readings, they believe they reproduce the text current in the Church during the course of the 2d century. This edition has met with determined opposition, especially on the part of Scrivener and Burgon. These two scholars maintain that in the reconstruction of the Greek text all available authorities must be considered, and the most ancient must not be given the sole right of being heard. J. B. McClellan, too, based his English version of the Gospels (1875) on a revision of the Greek text, in which internal probability is taken as the most trustworthy guide in the selection between variants. Other good editions of the Greek text have been published by Weymouth, Gebhardt, Nestle, Brandscheid, and Hetzenauer.

Recent Discoveries.—In recent years quite

a number of discoveries have been made which have an important bearing on the textual criticism of the New Testament. The Arabic text of Tatian's 'Diatessaron' has come to light, and was edited by Ciasca in 1888. The so-called second Epistle of Clement was discovered by Bryennios in 1875. In the last named manuscript was also contained the Teaching of the Apostles, but it was not made known till 1883. A fragment of the Gospel of Peter was discovered in 1886 by members of the French Archaeological Mission, who conducted excavations in the cemetery of Akhmim, in upper Egypt. The Sinaitic Syriac manuscript was discovered by Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson in 1892, during their visit to the Monastery of Saint Catharine, on Mount Sinai. Part of the Codex Purpureus was brought to light in 1896 in the neighborhood of Cæsarea. Finally, some Sayings of our Lord were discovered by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt in 1896 and 1903 on the site of the ancient Oxyrhynchus, in Egypt.

Results.—Confining ourselves to general statements, we may derive the following conclusions from what has been said: (1) The material for the textual criticism of the New Testament is constantly growing. (2) In Mill's time the number of variants in the New Testament was estimated at 30,000; in 1874 Scrivener counted at least 120,000; Schaff stated in 1892 that they did not fall much short of 150,000. (3) There are more variants than words in the New Testament; in fact, there are about 20 variants to each single verse, and they increase with each new discovery. (4) Lower criticism shows that we need not be alarmed at the number of these variants, and that the substance of the New Testament is absolutely certain. (5) Dr. Hort, who is surely good authority in this question, tells us that "the amount of what can in any sense be called substantial variation . . . can hardly form more than a thousandth part of the entire text." (6) Kennen enumerates only four passages in which the variants touch matters of faith: Mk. i. 1; Act. xx. 28; 1 Cor. xv. 51; and 1 Tim. iii. 16. But our faith is not affected by these variants; the revealed truth contained in these four passages is sufficiently certain from other texts of the New Testament. (7) Our classical scholars are satisfied that we possess the true text of those classical works of antiquity that have come down to us, though our knowledge of these works depends on a mere handful of manuscripts, while the manuscripts of the New Testament are counted by hundreds and even thousands. (8) The fact that our New Testament variants differ only in form, not in substance, excludes the hypothesis that it is the result of syncretism. The very defenders of this hypothesis seem to feel the difficulty; hence they declare that the New Testament presents "a syncretism without parallel in literature, unless in the Old Testament." (9) The number of manuscripts, of ancient versions, and of patristic quotations, is so great that it is practically certain that the original text of the New Testament is preserved in some one or another of these ancient authorities. This cannot be said of any other book of antiquity.

Higher Criticism.—The name Higher Criticism (q.v.) implies that it deals with problems more important than those of the textual or

lower criticism. These problems are the questions concerning the integrity, the authenticity, the literary form, and the trustworthiness of the various books. In the case of profane writings, these topics have been considered by a science called Literary Criticism. The higher critic ought to employ in his work not only the evidence of the literary work itself, but also external evidence that may be at his command. The internal evidence comprises the style of the book, the views of its author, allusions to past or contemporary events, geographical and chronological data, religious, moral, and political principles, grammatical forms, lexicographical peculiarities; in fact, all the details that offer a solid basis for comparing the work under consideration with other literary products of the same period of time or by the same author. After all these elements have been considered, the actual work of comparison can safely be undertaken.

Faults of Higher Criticism.—We do not say that all higher critics are sophists, nor do we imply that sophistry occurs more frequently in higher criticism than in any other branch of human science; we wish only to point out some faults that higher critics have actually committed in their process of reasoning. (1) Many higher critics begin their work with a prejudiced or biased mind. While the orthodox inquirer cares very little whether he has to admit a supernatural fact more or less, and is therefore free to follow objective evidence, the unbeliever is pledged *a priori* not to admit any supernatural fact, seeing that a single fact of this kind would upset all his theories. If Christianity, they say, originated from Jesus, then he must have been superhuman. But nothing superhuman must be admitted at any cost. Hence Christianity must be considered as the syncretism of its age, the last efflorescence of the Judæo-Greco-Roman Spirit. And all this vague terminology blinds them to the fact that this hypothesis involves a greater miracle than they have sought to avoid. (2) The higher critics often infer *a posse ad esse*; they imagine that a certain fact can be explained according to a given hypothesis, and forthwith that hypothesis is upheld as the only explanation. History and common sense may go against their inference, but all this cannot make them change their point of view; *stet pro ratione voluntas*. (3) The higher critics often change the degree of certainty of their contentions as they go along. First, something *may* be true; next, it is *probably* true; again, it is *certainly* true; finally, they actually refer back to their preceding statement with the words, "we have *proved* this to be so." (4) The argument of silence, too, has been highly favored by certain higher critics, though no regard was paid to the conditions under which alone this argument is of any value. (5) Again, higher critics are apt to pronounce judgment on topics outside their sphere of study. They claim to give an opinion on matters theological, philosophical, historical, scientific without the least hesitation; they even feel aggrieved if their criticism is criticised.

First Beginning of Higher Criticism.—The name higher criticism is of comparatively recent origin, but its principles are very old. In the last century before Christ, Dionysius of Halicarnassus won great renown by his crit-

ical acumen. In the early days of the Church, too, the books of Scripture were defended against the attacks of a Porphyry and a Celsus by men like Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome by an appeal to the principles that are employed by our present-day higher critics. It is true that during the course of the succeeding ages our great Christian scholars were imbued with too great a reverence for the inspired books to subject them to the critical process applied in the case of profane literature. Still, there were notable exceptions even to this rule. The introductory treatises to the Bible as a whole or to its several books were applications of critical principles. Richard Simon (1638-1712) applied the same in a pre-eminently masterful way in his famous work, 'Histoires Critiques du Vieux Testament, du Texte et des Versions du Nouveau Testament.' The erudite works of Dom Calmet, too, give evidence of skilled critical inquiry.

The Age of Scoffers.—Though raillery is no longer the equivalent of argument, it is instructive to review the attempts made to undermine the authority of the Scriptures by means of this weapon. Among the scoffers Voltaire holds a pre-eminent place. The tradition that he copied his difficulties against the credibility of the Bible out of Dom Calmet's works without either adding their solution or indicating his sources, is too well known to need repetition. In his wake followed the French encyclopædists. A panegyrist calls Voltaire the king who succeeded Louis XIV., and who handed the royal sceptre over to Napoleon. Among his ministers figure such celebrated men as Diderot, D'Alembert, Buffon, Helvétius, D'Holbach, D'Argens, Lamettrie, Turgot, Condorcet, and in a way also Rousseau and Montesquieu. The king himself had learned his trade among the Deists of England, whither he was forced to withdraw in 1726, and where he remained for about two years. Cherbury, Toland, Tindal, Woolston, Collins, Bolingbroke, Chubb, Whiston, Shaftesbury, Whittey, Somers, Wharton, Shrewsbury, and Buckingham figure among the principal apostles of English Deism.

Rationalism.—In Germany three forces had been at work to prepare the minds of the people for disbelief in the New Testament: First, the Wolfian philosophy had freed the mind from the strict letter of the Bible; secondly, the New Testament editions of Wetstein and Griesbach had shaken the readers' confidence in the inspired text; thirdly, Bengel and Crusius had modified the current notion of inspiration, insisting more on the active part of the inspired instruments than on their passive condition. The public was thus ready to appreciate Lessing's publication of the 'Fragments of Wolfenbüttel,' the work of his deceased friend Samuel Reimar (d. 1768). The first part of this work published in 1774 inculcated tolerance for the Deists; the second part appearing in 1777 was a general attack on revelation; the third part published in 1778 was directed against Jesus and his apostles, practically representing them as so many deceivers.

But this attack on the reliability of the New Testament was too brutal to become popular. Hence Paulus (1761-1851) proposed a hypothesis which removed the supernatural element

from the New Testament as effectively as Reimarus had done, and at the same time saved the veracity of the inspired writers. In his 'Leben Jesu' (1828) he distinguishes two kinds of supernatural elements in the Gospels: one kind is carried into the Gospels by the interpreters against the intention of the inspired writers; another kind is really intended by the sacred text. The former is removed by a proper method of interpreting the Bible; the latter must be regarded as the result of the subjective impression of the evangelists. They were rude, uncultured fishermen, and judged of the extraordinary phenomena in the life of their Master in a way that was neither scientific nor rational. In brief, according to Paulus, the writers of the New Testament are no longer deceivers, but they were incompetents.

The reliability of the New Testament fared still worse in the 'Leben Jesu' published (1835, 1864, 1874) by Strauss (1808-71). He apparently saves both the veracity and the competency of the sacred writers, but he declares their work to be a mere collection of myths. The storm raised in Germany by this work is too well known to need further description.

Strauss had studied only the contents of the Gospels without paying due attention to the Gospels themselves. Ferdinand Christian Baur (1809-82) perceived this weak point in the work of his pupil, and endeavored to strengthen it. He believed that he had discovered the key to the history of early Christianity in the romance of the so-called Clementine Homilies. The opposition between Peter and Paul and their respective parties he traced back from these homilies into the books of the New Testament, in which the opposition between Petrinism and Paulinism was said to be either reflected or harmonized or again considered as past. Only the Apocalypse of John, the Epistles to the Galatians, to the Romans, and to the Corinthians were admitted as genuine; all the rest of the New Testament was pronounced pseudonymous, and relegated into the 2d century. Here we have the tenets of the Tübingen school.

Anti-Tübingen Movement.—Baur made several vital mistakes in his assumptions: (1) His fundamental thesis concerning the great opposition between Paul and the other apostles cannot be proved (cf. Weber, 'Katholik,' 1898, pp. 193 ff.; 1899, pp. 45 ff.). (2) Baur's preference for the four great Pauline Epistles was merely personal; subsequent negative criticism has not spared their genuineness (cf. Bruno Bauer, 'Kritik der paul. Briefe,' 1850-2; Steck, 'Der Galaterbrief nach seiner Echtheit untersucht,' 1888; Pierson, 'De Bergrede,' 1878). (3) Baur was wrong in his utter neglect of early Christian tradition. The testimony of a Clement of Rome, an Ignatius, a Justin, a Marcion, an Irenæus, and a Tertullian should not be set aside at the bidding of merely subjective considerations. Hilgenfeld, in his 'Historisch-kritische Einleitung in das Neue Testament' (1875), acknowledged the genuineness of several New Testament books rejected by Baur; Reuss, in his 'Geschichte der heil. Schriften d. N. T.' (1842), restores the origin of the whole New Testament, excepting 1 Pet., to the 1st century. Similar conclusions were reached by Ewald, B. Weiss, Hofmann, Schulze, Godet, Zahn, Harnack, and other writers. On the

whole, our most recent critics admit that early Christian tradition ought to be respected, and though the defenders of the general genuineness of the New Testament books encounter still strenuous opposition, as has been seen on the occasion of the publication of Zahn's 'Einleitung,' they are no longer charged with lack of scientific method.

Syncretism.—There are critics who maintain that the striving to understand Jesus as the originating source of Christianity must prove abortive. They believe that "the most enlightened scholarship of Europe and America has no standing before the bar of logic." The genesis of Christianity, we are told, "must be sought in the collective consciousness of the first Christian and immediately pre-Christian centuries; in the amalgamation of faiths when all the currents of philosophic and theosophic thought dashed together their waters in the vast basin of the Roman circummediterranean empire." But how can organic unity develop out of heterogeneity? How can concord develop out of discord and opposition? The material elements which compose the plant or the brute beast exist before either plant or beast begin to live; but who will imagine that a horse or a cow will be the result of the dashing together of their respective material elements? Moreover, Monsignor Batiffol ('Revue biblique,' January 1903) has shown that between 120 and 140 A.D. Marcion wrote a treatise proving that an opposition exists between the Law and the Gospel; at that early period therefore the Gospel was considered as possessing paramount authority. Again, Marcion appealed to Saint Paul in proof for the absolute newness and independence of Christianity. At Marcion's time therefore there existed a Canon of the New Testament books. And why should the faithful have esteemed the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles higher than the Epistles of an Ignatius, unless they were convinced that these canonical writings contained the exact teaching of the Master? The authority of Christ's word had preceded the authority of the canonical books.

What is Christ?—Higher critics distinguish between the Christ of history and the Christ of Christianity. Harnack, Wrede, and Staerk may be said to simply rob Christianity of its Christ. Schmiedel, O. Holtzmann, Bousset, and Schürer endeavor to link the Christ of history together with the Christ of Christianity, but their explanations are unsatisfactory. The Abbé Loisy, too, distinguishes a triple Christ: first, the views of Christ concerning himself; secondly, the faith of the early Christian community concerning Christ; thirdly, the Christology of the New Testament. And if you ask on what the faith of Christianity is based, if not on the facts of history, there will be as many different answers as there are writers. So that we rightly urge against our present-day higher critics the dilemma: Christ is either God, or what is He?

Bibliography.—A fairly complete list of the older literature belonging to this subject may be found in Reuss, 'History of the New Testament' (Vol. II., p. 367 f.); O. von Gebhardt adds to the preceding a fairly complete list of the pertinent literature down to about 1806 in his 'Urtext und Übersetzungen der Bibel,' which is a reprint of his articles on 'Bibel-

text und Bibelübersetzungen,' contributed to the 'Realencyclopædie,' pp. 16, 54 ff. A reference to the contemporary literature may be found in the numbers of the 'Ecclesiastical Review' under the heading 'Recent Bible Study.' Besides, the reader may consult Rose, 'Studies on the Gospels' (authorized English translation by Mgr. Robert Fraser, 1904); Lagrange, 'La Méthode Historique' (Paris 1904); Lagrange, 'Études sur les Religions Sémitiques' (Paris 1905); Chauvin, 'La Bible depuis ses Origines jusqu'à nos jours' (Paris 1903); Chauvin, 'L'Enfance du Christ d'après les Traditions Juives et Chrétiennes' (Paris 1904); Chauvin, 'Le Procès de Jésus-Christ' (Paris 1904); Calmes, 'Comment se sont formés les Évangiles' (Paris 1904); Fonsegrive, 'L'Attitude du Catholique devant la Science' (Paris 1903); 'Jésus-Christ, Est-il resuscité' (Paris 1901); Chauvin, 'Histoire de l'Antéchrist' (Paris 1901); Chauvin, 'Au Golgotha' (Paris 1905); Méchineau, 'L'Origine apostolique du Nouveau Testament' (Paris 1903); Méchineau, 'L' Autorité humaine des Livres Saints' (Paris 1903); Colomer, 'La Bible et les Théories Scientifiques' (Paris 1904); Saubin, 'La Synagogue Moderne' (Paris 1903); Vallet, 'Les Miracles de l'Évangile' (Paris 1905); Saubin, 'Le Dogme Chrétien dans la Religion Juive' (Paris 1900); Saubin, 'Le Talmud et la Synagogue Moderne' (Paris 1900); Paulus, 'Les Juifs et le Messie' (Paris 1904).

ANTHONY J. MAAS, S.J.,
Professor of Hebrew and Sacred Scripture,
Woodstock College.

New Testament Theology, that branch of the theological science which has for its peculiar task to state, arrange and compare the theological doctrines and conceptions found in the New Testament. While it might be combined with Old Testament theology under the name Biblical theology, yet the differences in dates, language, style and contents between the Old Testament and the New are such that their respective theologies have usually been treated separately, although their methods are necessarily identical. It is also possible to state the doctrinal teachings and theological conceptions of any individual author, and even those found in any single work of any author, and such contributions to Biblical theology have often proved exceedingly valuable; but the historic unity of the New Testament renders it practically important that the teachings and views of the various New Testament authors should be so presented and compared as to give but a single impression of the whole.

Character and Relations.—New Testament theology is strictly a historical science, neither attacking nor defending the conceptions which it finds, but merely stating, arranging and comparing them. As a historical science it is connected with Ecclesiastical History, and might be considered the first volume of the History of Christian Doctrine. But it demands such a mastery of the results of the sciences of Isaagogy and Exegesis on which it depends, that it is usually associated rather with interpretation, of which it might be reckoned the crown. It also presupposes and builds upon Old Testament history and the history of the world in New Testament times, and in its turn it provides much material for Dogmatics.

History.—The name Biblical Theology, which had earlier been employed to designate such a system of dogmatics as was based upon the Scriptures rather than upon either creeds or reason, was first used in its modern sense by Gabler in 1787, since which time the science in its application both to the Old Testament and the New has gradually developed. The first American work in the sphere of New Testament theology was published in 1870, and the first lectures in any American theological school are said to have been given in 1883. Since then it has received a steadily increasing amount of attention.

Difficulties.—The task of the New Testament theologian presents peculiar difficulties. It is impossible for him to increase the amount of the material with which he deals, however helpful for supplementing or verifying his conclusions such increase might be. All expression of thought is defective, and most of all is this true in theology, where upon words derived from the earthly and the human is laid the burden of declaring the heavenly and the divine. Further, the teachings to be considered come in a form due to ancient ages, tongues, and conditions, and accordingly accurately and adequately to restate in modern form thoughts which have thus come down in ancient garb cannot be easy. Then, since with few exceptions the theological thoughts contained in the New Testament found expression solely for ends then immediately practical, it follows that the statements are often partial and incomplete, and the emphasis upon certain aspects of truth is only relative, and these statements must be read with constant reference to the thought of the age and the details of the local situation to which they belong. Hence only with difficulty can the incomplete expressions of practical religious thought be fitted together to reconstitute such systems of doctrine as may be credibly attributed to the various New Testament authors.

Grouping of the Books.—There is general agreement as to the grouping of the New Testament books according to the types of thought which they exemplify. The teaching of Jesus demands attention first, if not as a standard for the rest or as of superior authoritative, as at any rate prior in time to the other New Testament teachings and as presupposed by them. The records of Christ's teaching are necessarily subdivided into the Synoptic and Johannine reports. The second group of documents represents the type of Christian thought which developed among Christians of Hebrew descent, and consists of the first part of the book of Acts, the letters of James and Jude, the two letters of Peter (which, however, show that there had been a development considerably beyond the primitive conceptions current in the church), and such traces of apostolic or other early doctrine as may be noted in the Gospels. In the Pauline section the Epistles attributed to this Apostle fall naturally into four groups, which differ in theme and matter as well as in date and style. If any of these letters should not be held to be Pauline in origin, they are yet so distinctly in harmony with Paul's views that this would not change their place in the general classification, while the Epistle to the Hebrews is a natural pendant to the writings of Paul. The fourth

group of New Testament writings consists of the books attributed to the Apostle John, consisting of his letters, of so much of the Fourth Gospel as is not the teaching of Christ and of the Revelation.

Kingdom of Heaven.—In the Synoptic reports Jesus began his teaching by echoing the proclamation of his forerunner, John the Baptist: "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." While from the beginning of this preaching he seems to have recognized that he himself was to be the head of the promised kingdom, yet his own conception of the character and work of the Messiah was so different from the popular conception, so much loftier and purer, that he could not present himself at once and unreservedly as the Coming King, for, had he immediately and unmistakably advanced his claim, political enthusiasm would have forestalled religious faith, and even on the part of true followers earthly ideals, expectations and plans would have obscured and neutralized heavenly, as, indeed, to some extent actually occurred in spite of caution and reserve. The name kingdom of heaven or of God, however, remained prominent throughout the teaching of Jesus, but in the latter part of it with an altered meaning. Convinced that he had nothing to hope from the leaders of the nation or the people whom they controlled for the kingdom of prophecy, which was intended to reach its spiritual ends through a local, national, political organization, Jesus necessarily substituted individual submission to the sovereignty of God, and retaining the name without the form, the kingdom which he strove to establish became in his teaching universal and spiritual.

Repentance and Faith.—While the state of individuals and society which he would establish thus took a new form in consequence of his rejection by his nation, the conditions of entrance, as well as the ultimate ends to be attained, remain unchanged. The first demand upon each and all is for repentance. As a morally transformed and thus fit nation should have met its King come at last, so only a soul turned from evil to good can receive the spiritual blessings which Jesus bestows. More and more clearly as antagonism gave renewed opportunity, Jesus denounced sin and demanded from all without exception penitence and reformation, although in serene consciousness of sinlessness he ever held himself apart from all confession of any evil on his own part.

The Supreme Place of Christ.—With repentance as a reversal of moral tendency must come acceptance of himself as Supreme Master and absolute submission to him. His demand for self-denial is a demand for complete self-abjuration; his invitation, "Come unto Me," is not only an invitation, but no less the presentation of himself to the world as the one fountain of spiritual blessing; to receive him he says is to receive God himself, and personal service to him is regarded as proof of sins forgiven; devotion beyond all other loves is required, and so absolutely supreme is the relation of the soul to him that on confession or denial of him he makes the issues of the future life to hinge. This relation is made still more significant by the few but clear and emphatic teachings as to his death, by virtue of which as a ransom salvation would be rendered possible for men.

God's Love.—The fourth element in the

teaching of Jesus which the Synoptists record relates to God. This teaching is almost never metaphysical, only religious and practical. The chief thought in it is God's love. This love, which exceeds that of any earthly father for his child, is shown in the rising of the sun on the evil and the good alike and the coming of the rain on both just and unjust, and in care for sparrows, ravens and lilies, and finds its crown of perfectness in kindness to the unworthy. The climax of this teaching appears in the parables about rescue of the lost, in the third of which, usually called the "Parable of the Prodigal Son," this tender love of God is so winningly presented that it has given a very common name for the love of God, so that all Christ's teaching is said by many to be dominated by the thought of God's "Fatherhood," a view which should be so held as to include the other conceptions of Jesus as to God's special relation of fatherhood to believers, and his unique fatherhood to Christ himself.

Johannine Teaching of Jesus.—In the Gospel of John the teaching of Jesus is presented with a superficial dissimilarity at first sight striking, but in essential consistency with the Synoptic reports. As the place of the ministry reported is largely the city of Jerusalem instead of the open country of Galilee, as we have often hostile Pharisees for interlocutors instead of disciples for reverent auditors, so of the four chief elements of the Synoptic teaching, the Kingdom, Repentance and Faith, his own unique supremacy and the fatherly Love of God, the kingdom is scarcely mentioned, repentance is ignored and faith given a different aspect, and the paternal kindness of God is much less emphasized, while Jesus insists even more upon his own pre-eminence and shows it in new lights.

Deity of Christ.—The two foci of the teaching reported in the Fourth Gospel are, as might be expected from the author's own statement of his purpose as stated at the end of his writing, the deity of Christ and the duty of Faith. All the discourses in the Gospel are selected with a view to showing Christ's self-revelation to the world on the one hand and to his disciples on the other. While his Messiahship is not here emphasized, there is presented instead a conception of a sonship based on a unique unity with God, combined with hints of pre-existence, suggestions and implications of divinity and, finally, a welcome by Jesus to the assertion of his deity.

Faith.—The proper relation on the part of his disciples, and, indeed, of all men, toward this personality who thus presents himself is not mere acceptance of statements about him and of truths relating to him, but further spiritual union with him by entering into relations to him, appropriation, in a word.

Judaic Teaching.—The earliest Apostolic teaching and the type of doctrine which seems long to have prevailed among the churches which were of Judaic origin and cast, was only to a very slight degree dogmatic, and brought no enlarged or corrected doctrines touching the nature of God or the character of men. Indeed, no New Testament authors ever approach these themes as if intending to communicate fresh truth, but rather to confirm and apply truth already commonly apprehended. The chief thought of the primitive church was the place and rank of Jesus, and here even the earliest teaching of the Apostles is developed in many

