THE FIRST CHRISTIAN CENTURY

WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 170. With Maps and Illustrations. 8vo, cloth, 12*s*.

St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen. With Maps. 8vo, 10*s*. 6*d*.

Impressions of Turkey. Crown 8vo, cloth, 6*s*.

Was Christ Born at Bethlehem? A Study in the Credibility of St. Luke. Crown 8vo, cloth, 5*s*.

A Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. With Maps. 8vo, cloth, 12*s*.

The Education of Christ: Hill-side Reveries. Purple cloth, net, 2*s*.; leather, net, 2*s*. 6*d*.

The Letters to the Seven Churches. With 52 Plates and Illustrations and a Map. 8vo, cloth, 12*s*.

Pauline and other Studies. With 40 Plates and Illustrations and 2 Maps. 8vo, cloth, 12*s*.

The Cities of St. Paul. With 74 Plates and Illustrations and 4 Maps. 8vo, cloth, 12*s*.

Luke the Physician, and other Studies in the History of Religion. With 38 Plates and Illustrations. 8vo, cloth, 12*s*.

The Revolution in Constantinople and Turkey in 1909. A Diary of Travelling Experiences. With many Photographs taken by LADY RAMSAY. 10*s*. 6*d*. net.

Pictures of the Apostolic Church. Crown 8vo, cloth, 6*s*.

Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Provinces of the Roman Empire. Edited by Sir W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., LL.D., LITT.D. 20*s*. net.

The Thousand and One Churches. By Prof. Sir W. M. RAMSAY and Miss GERTRUDE L. BELL. With over 400 Illustrations. 20*s*. net.

BOOKS BY LADY RAMSAY.

Everyday Life in Turkey. Crown 8vo, cloth, 5*s*.
The Romance of Elisávet. Crown 8vo, cloth, 5*s*.

LONDON: HODDER & STOUGHTON.

THE FIRST CHRISTIAN CENTURY

NOTES ON DR. MOFFATT'S
INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

BY

SIR W. M. RAMSAY

HODDER AND STOUGHTON
LONDON NEW YORK TORONTO
1911

PREFACE.

As a German classical scholar remarked (I think in "Hermes") some years ago, the methods of Biblical criticism are coming to be a jest among philologists. This book is a protest in the name of history and of literature against the revival of a method in criticism which I had supposed to be antiquated and discredited.

To the ordinary Classical scholar it seems almost a crime to place at wrong dates, and attribute to anonymous and fictitious authors, writings of the highest value as historical authorities and as works of literature. It is a duty to raise one's voice against such a theory. That

the most powerful and lasting movement of the human mind originated in the Church's misunderstanding of a simple person, and was nursed in the "pseudonymous" composition of legend or half-legend about him, is a theory against which I hope always to contend. As soon persuade me that the "great renunciation" of Buddha is a legend! But Buddhism never became a "religion of the Book," and the power of Christianity lies in the Book (as Mohammedans say).

The present work is an enlargement of a series of articles which were written for the most part in trains and hotels, among the excavations by the American scholars at Sardis and under the shadow of Lycaonian hills.

CONTENTS.

THE FIRST CHRISTIAN CENTURY:

NOTES ON DR. MOFFATT'S "INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT".

I. General.

Dr. Moffatt is a figure of considerable interest and importance in the world of New Testament scholarship. He has read very widely in the modern literature of the subject. He has some remarkable literary gifts. He possesses an exceptional faculty for detecting analogies between different classes of literature, in cases where the analogies are more or less hidden by the surroundings. His series of articles called "Opera Foris" in the "Expositor" contained many noteworthy and often really brilliant illustrations of this kind, which at-

tested the wide range of his reading, his instinctive and broad sympathy with the thought of others, and his wonderful power of combination. His "Historical New Testament" might fairly be described as the work of a very clever young student, with an astonishing power of assimilating and reproducing in new combinations the opinions (or, as they are called, "results") of older scholars. This is a stage which the brilliant young scholar has to go through; and perhaps the happiest lot for him is to get through it quickly, and not to publish anything until it has been safely traversed. That book, however, was at least pardonable as the work of a young man transported with the enthusiasm of reading, who had not as yet had the leisure to do much real thinking, because the acquisitive process had for the time absorbed his energy and temporarily starved the independence of his intellect.

The "Historical New Testament" possessed at any rate the interest that always belongs to an early stage in the growth of a personality capable of becoming independent and even

great, provided that circumstances prove favourable to its development. For my own part I held the opinion, and several times expressed it to others, that the writer of that book would within twenty years do some really good work, and would then partly smile at, and partly regret, his youthful enthusiasm for the ingenious vagaries of forgotten theorists, after his powers had grown stronger and his judgment had matured through experience of life. On one occasion later, when I read in the "British Weekly" a really beautiful leader to which his signature was attached, I claimed credit for having detected under the surface of that early book signs of the fine true quality and the sympathetic feeling which were clearly shown in that subsequent article in a weekly newspaper.

The present work, however, has gone back to the standard of the "Historical New Testament". I can detect no broadening of the outlook, no deepening of the sympathy, little sign of growing independence of thought. The book is antiquated, as if it belonged to the nineteenth

century. I do not mean that the author has failed to pay attention to more recent studies on the subject. Quite the contrary. Dr. Moffatt has allowed little or nothing in recent work to escape him. He has been reading the last products of scholarship with the same carefulness and voracity as before, when he wrote the "Historical New Testament". But his method is much the same as formerly. He takes up the more recent theories with the same earnestness and—I will not say enthusiasm, but rather the same perfectly confident assumption that the right way of study lies in sifting and weighing these theories and thus discovering in them "here a little and there a little" which is correct and valuable, and also with the same antecedent conviction that a certain amount of truth is to be found somewhere amid the mass of writing. This method he would doubtless defend on the ground that he has thus been "moving with the times" and "keeping in the van of modern research"—(one knows the stock phrases); but, if the initial principle is wrong, it is as useless when applied to the critics, whether "orthodox"

or "progressive,"[1] of the period 1900-1910 as when applied to those of the preceding fifty years.

To us the result appears to be that Dr. Moffatt has grown more learned, but that his individuality is as deeply buried as ever; and we cannot forget that it is harder to force one's way out into spiritual independence after ten more years spent in tabulating the results and opinions of other men. He is fit for far higher work than this; but the time is shortened.

In literary criticism it is not uncommon to assume that, because a book shows great learning and ingenuity and ability, therefore there must be a certain amount of truth and value in it; and Dr. Moffatt seeks for this residuum of truth after riddling out all the rubbish; but that is not scientific method.

Many a writer starts his investigation on a false principle, and deduces a series of perfectly logical and wonderfully ingenious conclusions, which share in the weakness of the initial assumption; the sole value of the book, then, is to

[1] I apologize for using these cant terms; but desire for brevity forces one to employ them.

demonstrate the falsity of the first principle. There are many works of modern literary criticism which assume the whole contents and issues in the opening pages; and after reading the earlier paragraphs one can lay the book aside, because one already possesses all that is to follow.

Specific examples one shrinks from giving; it is an invidious thing to do; but I shall give just one, which I find in the writings of a friend of my own, an excellent scholar, who did some excellent work, the late Dr. W. G. Rutherford; in this case no one can charge me with censorious motives. Dr. Moffatt quotes[1] a sentence from Dr. Rutherford's edition of "The Fourth Book of Thucydides," page xxxi: "Nothing could have prevented the importation into the text of an author of a great deal of what was properly comment". That principle of criticism was quite fashionable for a time among recent scholars. It sounds very plausible: one readily sees the process by which the gloss written on the margin of a page of a manuscript was mis-

[1] Footnote to p. 36.

taken by a subsequent copyist for a part of the text that had been forgotten by the writer of the manuscript; the copyist, making this mistake, put the gloss into the text of his copy at the point at which it seemed to belong. Start with Dr. Rutherford's principle that this must have frequently happened; sit in your study month after month and year after year working at your author; add the magnificent ingenuity and erudition of that great scholar. The result is—his edition of "Thucydides, Book IV," the main value of which, and of some other modern works on similar lines, simply is to prove that the initial principle is false. The general agreement of more recent scholars has condemned the principle; and the discovery in Egypt of many fragments of very early manuscripts on papyrus has gone far in the way of justifying the manuscript text.

It is quite true that those glosses might through a series of errors have crept into the text, and also that they did in a few cases creep in; but, as a whole, this did not often happen, and glosses generally were recognized as such

and vanished from subsequent copies. The scare raised by Dr. Rutherford and by others before him was not more reasonable than the alarm of a merchant, to whom the thought suddenly occurred that all his clerks might be frequently making mistakes in entering figures in account books. Mistakes of that kind are quite possible, and are in some cases made by clerks; but, on the whole, it is safe to say that they need not be taken into reckoning.

It is therefore not right to quote an exploded *dictum* of Dr. Rutherford's as if it were quite trustworthy. Dr. Moffatt's pages 37-38, giving examples of glosses and interpolations in classical authors, contain some that are not correctly stated, and many that are not really analogous to the phenomena which he seeks to establish in regard to the text of the New Testament, along with others that are good and useful, if properly applied.

II. Literary Illustrations in the Book.

If I attempt to justify my inability to praise this book in the way that I should like, and in the way that (as I have already mentioned) I at one time anticipated, I enter on the task with much reluctance and diffidence, yielding only to the urgent wish expressed by several friends. To put my opinion in a sentence, I should say that the author never reaches the historical point of view; he never shows any comprehension of the way in which great events work themselves out. It may be said, of course, that he is writing an "Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament," and not a study of early Christian history; but in a surpassing degree the literature of the New Testament is the expression of the life of the Church, and can never be rightly understood if it is regarded simply as

literature. Dr. Moffatt knows that well,[1] and shows his knowledge by constantly correlating the literature with the development of the Church, as he conceives it; but he looks at history with a certain literary quality of mind, and not with the understanding and sympathy of practical knowledge. His many brilliant literary gifts, and especially his wonderful power of detecting literary analogies, tend to warp his historical judgment, and require sometimes to be sternly controlled by him.

The author brings his wide reading in modern literature to bear on the illustration of his subject by profuse quotations and elaborate comparisons or similes. Sometimes these "purple patches" lighten up rather quaintly the laborious collection of opinions and references. On page 594, "The Homeric hymns, it has been said, are neither hymns nor Homer's. The so-called

[1] He will not dissent from this opinion that right study of the literature of the New Testament is impossible without keeping the eye constantly turned towards historical method: as he says in the "Historical New Testament," p. 56, "true criticism of the New Testament is like science, it becomes 'a precious visitant' only when it has been trained in the methods of historical evolution".

'first epistle of John' is neither an epistle nor is it John's, if by John is meant the son of Zebedee." Then a few lines down the page, "Lord Hailes once pointed out to Boswell his additions to a legal paper originally drawn up by Dr. Johnson. The editor of 'First John' had, in all likelihood, some share in the editorial process through which the Fourth Gospel reached its final form." There would have been more point in the allusion to Lord Hailes, if, like him, the editor of "First John" had pointed out to some one the additions that he made to the Gospel; but these unfortunately remain uncertain. The allusion to the Homeric hymns is a piece of smart writing, but savours too much of flippant journalism. There is no real analogy, nothing but the forced and purely verbal analogy of an epigrammatic balance.

Much better in taste, and much more apt and illuminative as an illustration, is the comparison on page 148 between "Romans" and Burke's "Reflections on the Revolution in France".[1]

[1] This illustration, which is a good one, helping to make the author's view more distinct and at the same

In both cases what was begun as a letter grew beyond the character of a letter, and yet retained the outward form of one.

Not so illuminative, but still quite pertinent and in good taste, is the quotation from Theocritus and the elaborate application of it on page 597. It is purely ornamental, it is only a "purple patch"; but it is ingenious, clever, and interesting.

On page 171 we have a very favourable specimen of Dr. Moffatt's comparisons. As Baur and Manen judged of Philippians, "so did Johnson judge of Gray". This well brings out by a brief touch the utter inability of Baur and Manen to sympathize with, and therefore to judge, Paul, though it errs by suggesting that a clever writer like Baur and a stupid one like Manen can be put on a level with a great man like Johnson. But why not extend the comparison? It is just because Dr. Moffatt quotes

time constituting a justifiable argument in favour of his view, because it shows by analogy that the process supposed can really occur, was used already in the Author's "Historical New Testament" (as I observe later).

such a portentous number of unsympathizing and therefore incapable and unprofitable Baurs and Manens, that his book is profitless and even dull. Moreover, he in the comparison subtly suggests that in all these cases one great man judges another. We learn from Johnson on Gray, because the critic, though out of sympathy, is still a man of genius, who is instructive even when he misses the truth; but Manen, or even Baur, sitting in judgment on Paul, is a mole attempting to estimate the size of a colossus, or the strength of a lion, or the swiftness of an eagle in the air.

Again on page 204, in the extremely hypothetical sketch of the "fortunes of Q," we are told that "it suffered a sea-change, when it was employed by Matthew". Shakespeare is dragged in here, without any special appropriateness, unless Dr. Moffatt's intention is to suggest very delicately that Q is a thing "that doth fade". The writing here is smart, the veiled allusion to a familiar passage of "The Tempest" is clever and lights up the rather arid page, and I quote it as typical, as probably likely to please the reader

and to carry on his interest in the book, and certainly not as a blemish, since it does not injuriously affect the train of reasoning, while it has a certain literary quality.

In Dr. Moffatt's former book this kind of illustration by quotations from literature was much more sparingly used, and always, so far as I have observed, for the purpose of making his meaning clearer. The habit has grown upon him, however, until he has come to use his quotations in some cases almost as ornaments, and to let his judgment sometimes be carried away by a purely fanciful analogy which he has employed. I allude to this subject chiefly for the sake of leading on from the good or the harmless examples to those which seem to me to be injurious.[1] Accordingly, it is not my intention

[1] These literary and purely ornamental illustrations even obtain sometimes a place in the Index A of "Subjects and References," where they take up space that might be usefully employed. It seems odd to find Shakespeare mentioned three times, Jane Austen once, Byron twice, and so on, in the Index A, while Georgios Hamartolos does not occur in any of the Indices, though he is referred to in the text as an authority of consequence,

to lay stress on these examples of Dr. Moffatt's custom as if they were faults. They are mentioned as instances of the Author's character; and from them we may gather what is a tendency of his mind, and estimate his "personal equation". They are an interesting feature; and they are indicative of the literary rather than the historical temperament. That is what seems to me the fundamental truth. Our Author shows in a fashion extremely interesting to the student of human nature the course which the literary temperament may follow when it is allowed to run riot in historical investigation. It is in danger of essaying the problem in a misleading fashion. This I shall try to exemplify by taking some others of those ornate passages, in which the misleading influence that the habit may exercise is more conspicuous.

forming the main support of the Author's belief in the very early death of St. John, a critical point in his whole opinions.

III. Literature and History: a Difference of Method.

On page 8 Dr. Moffatt, in discussing "The Method of New Testament Introduction," illustrates the correct procedure for the historian in surveying the literature of a period by the following analogy. "In a note to the first chapter of 'The Fair Maid of Perth,' discussing the magnificent view of the Tay valley which may be gained from the Wicks of Baiglie, Scott quotes what a local guide said, on reaching a bold projecting rock on Craig Vinean, 'Ah, sirs, this is the decisive point'. One of the first objects of the literary historian, in attempting the survey of any period, is to secure the decisive point from which he may command the lie of the country, and see it as fully as possible in its natural proportions. Such a vantage ground lies usually at some distance from the particular literature,

That is one reason why the decisive point of elevation from which to scan the primitive Christian literature is to be found in the traditions which begin to rise by the second half of the second century."

I confess that I was aghast when I read these sentences. It would be hard to find a falser way of looking at the historical problem, and yet it is so ingenious and plausible, that the unwary reader may for the moment be misled by it. There is no analogy, except a verbal one, between the contemplation of scenery from a lofty point of view and the survey of a period in literature. In order to contemplate a landscape, it is necessary to reach a place from which the eye is able to see it; hence one contemplates it best from an elevated point at a little distance. In order to survey a period of literature, one gets into the most intimate sympathy with the writers. There is the most profound difference, and yet Dr. Moffatt does not see the difference. He labours to emphasize the analogy by verbal touches. The "decisive point" for the Christian literature is where "the traditions begin to

rise," just as the "decisive point" for that part of the Tay valley is where the "bold projecting rock on Craig Vinean rises"; but this is purely verbal trifling. If one is going to study the Elizabethan period of literature, one does not "secure the decisive point" in the period of Queen Anne or George I. One saturates oneself with the Elizabethan work, and grows into sympathy with it by close communion. The second half of the second century was a period quite as alien to the Apostolic period as that of A.D. 1702-30 was to the Elizabethan period. One cannot ascend a "decisive point" in a later period. Nor can one judge the older period better, or survey it more comprehensively, or appreciate it more sympathetically, by attempting to place oneself amid a later and uncomprehending group of writers. The whole idea is a verbal conceit, not unlike the fanciful trifling of the so-called "metaphysical" writers of the style of Donne in the early seventeenth century.

It is true that one often feels, in appraising the work of some contemporary author, that it is necessary to wait and to look back on him

from some point in the future, before one can determine with confidence his rank in the literature of the world. One is too near him to judge rightly his comparative rank. But this is because one dreads lest familiarity may warp the judgment, when the comparison is between a too familiar neighbour and older writers from whom one is far removed; and it gives no reason to think that, in trying to understand and sympathize with the literature of a remote period, one should look at it from "a vantage point" in a later and utterly uncomprehending time.

The truth is that Dr. Moffatt is trying to snatch from any side some justification for his false historical method; and, to his literary way of judging, this very clever verbal analogy presented itself as a real analogy and a powerful argument. It is his fashion throughout this book to put himself among "the traditions which begin to rise by the second half of the second century," and to regard the New Testament as similar, and as most easily seen and understood through the analogy. He is every-

where trying to do what he plans out for himself in these sentences which have just been quoted, and the result is—this book, utterly unsympathetic, absolutely external, and blind to the finest side of the literature that it treats.

IV. The First and the Late Second Century.

An extreme example of Dr. Moffatt's want of sensitiveness to the real nature of the New Testament literature may be quoted from page 315 f., where he speaks "of the perplexing differences between the Christian literature of the first and that of the second century. The latter reveals a series of striking personalities, while the New Testament literature, which is practically synonymous with the literature of the Church during the first century, has only one writer whose personality is well marked, i.e. the Apostle Paul. Luke, the historian, is known to us mainly from his writings, and these, from their very nature, are objective rather than subjective. The John of Asia Minor, whom we can detect behind the Johannine literature, must have been a commanding figure, but we

cannot feel him breathe and move as we can feel Paul. On the other hand, the second century and its literature reveal strong and versatile personalities from Ignatius to Irenaeus, from Polycarp to Tertullian, from Marcion and even Papias and Hegesippus to Justin, Tatian and Clement of Alexandria."

What do we know about the personality of Papias or Hegesippus or of their life? Nothing at all. What do we know of their works? Nothing but two or three fragments and a lot of riddles. They are not human beings to us. We know not one single action of their lives, and absolutely nothing about their character; and we can only speculate about the nature of their influence on contemporary society, and even about the method and quality of their literary work. Yet these are the names which Dr. Moffatt transforms into personalities; and for these third or fifth rate people he throws overboard Peter[1] and James and John and the rest of the New Testament writers.

[1] On Peter, see note p. 26.

V. The Personality of Papias and Polycarp.

There are, I must confess, in the figure of Papias no riddles for Dr. Moffatt. Papias is his pet child. For Papias he has constructed out of his own fancy a character and almost a personality, without any basis in ancient record, purely on the ground of his unhesitating penetration to the soul of those allusions which to most of us are riddles. He sees him, with Marcion and Hegesippus, stand forth as "strong and versatile personalities" in the brilliant light of the later second century, where we can only see them like shadows of "men as trees walking" in the dimness of that obscure period. It is just because Dr. Moffatt has pondered over that misty figure until he has re-invested Papias with his own conceptions of history that he loves and admires him so much. But that

ought to be reserved for his own private meditations. The portrait of Papias ought to hang in his study, not to adorn his book. It belongs to himself, not to the world.

Polycarp is a gracious, attractive and dignified figure, as we see him amid the darkling twilight; but "versatile" is the least suitable epithet that could have been selected for him. We know him in his personality fairly well: he is a real human being for us: so far Dr. Moffatt is right. He enjoyed the unbounded veneration of the Asian Christians, and he deserved it. He was regarded by the pagans as "the father of the Christians," and as the most dangerous enemy of the old gods. But "versatile"! Hear what Lightfoot, his devoted admirer, says of him. "Polycarp's mind was essentially unoriginative. It had, so far as we can discover, no creative power. His epistle is largely made up of quotations and imitations. . . . He himself never rises above mere commonplace. A steadfast stubborn adherence to the lessons of his youth and early manhood—an unrelaxing, unwavering hold of 'the word that was

delivered to him from the beginning'—this, so far as we can read the man from his own utterances or from the notices of others, was the characteristic of Polycarp."[1] A noble and dignified figure in his life, a pathetic and still more dignified figure in his death! But what is he or any of the others in Dr. Moffatt's list in comparison with John or Peter or even James, as they stand before us in the literature of the New Testament? A wren among the eagles.

Of course, when Dr. Moffatt has ejected most of the New Testament out of the realm of authenticity, then "the literature of the New Testament" becomes scanty and the period to which it belongs is left in mist. There remains, according to him, only Paul (who, however, loses Ephesians and 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus); and Paul, though considerably annotated and enlarged in parts, still throws, as Dr. Moffatt admits, a bright light on the period between 50 and 60 or 62 A.D.; but after Paul the darkness sets in, and Luke and Mark fail to lighten it. Mark has been edited until he is no longer

[1] Lightfoot, "Ignatius and Polycarp," i. p. 458.

recognizable; Luke is far from thoroughly trustworthy; and hence, I suppose, Dr. Moffatt fails to find any individuality or personality in Peter, who to us old-fashioned people is such a vivid, powerful, real and human figure.[1] One who set any store by the testimony of Luke in the Acts and in the Gospel could never find Peter or John so faint and unsatisfying. My belief is that Dr. Moffatt, if he had to compose from his natural instinct for a living audience a study of Peter, would forget for the moment the fine-spun web of printed conjecture, and paint for us in finely chosen words a picture of the great man, such as I can imagine for myself, though less skilfully than Dr. Moffatt could.

It is, however, quite natural that Dr. Moffatt should emerge from his study of modern theories about Ephesians, the Pastorals, the Catholic Epistles of James, Peter and John, the Revelation and the Fourth Gospel, "with a sense of

[1] In appearance Dr. Moffatt leaves the first Epistle of Peter as the work of the Apostle; but what he gives us with his right hand he takes away from us with the left; and the Epistle furnishes no real information about the Apostle's character; see Section XX.

baffled curiosity, which almost deepens into despair at some points". He has smashed up to his own complete and undoubting satisfaction the greatest epoch of literature, and he finds that there remains in it only the lay figure of a man of the province Asia named John, "whose breathing he cannot hear and whose motion he cannot see".

But those men of the later second century! they are Dr. Moffatt's heroes. He knows them: he feels really interested in them: he finds none of the difficulties which we find in comprehending them. Take one example of the way that he handles the evidence about them.

VI. Papias as Authority for the Early Death of John the Apostle.

A late chronicler, George the Sinful, devoid of ability or critical faculty or insight, and utterly valueless except that he preserves some older statements in an unintelligent and even erroneous form, quotes Papias and Origen as proving by their conjoined evidence that the Apostle John lived at Ephesus at least as late as Nerva, A.D. 96-98, at which time he was the sole survivor of the Twelve, and that he died a martyr. Dr. Moffatt takes this brief and vague reference to Papias, transforms it by his imaginative historical criticism, and it becomes thorough and trustworthy evidence that Papias recorded the death of John in Jerusalem along with James [1]

[1] Not necessarily on the same occasion and day, as Dr. Moffatt allows with some lingering respect for the evidence of the Acts—poor as that evidence, in his opinion, is. Fortunately Paul in Galatians II. mentions John as alive

at the very beginning of the history of the Church. From this, of course, it follows that the Apostle John never was at Ephesus, and never wrote either the letters of John, or the Gospel, or the Revelation.

That is the true, literal and simple statement of the quick-change process through which the Papias of history is transformed into the Papias whom Dr. Moffatt admires so much and knows so well. In the whole range of criticism I know nothing more extraordinary than this. I do not mean that Dr. Moffatt originated the transformation. It is all chronicled in German magazines and German treatises, which are mentioned by the Author with admirable care. The first champions, who feel themselves discoverers, of such a theory may be pardoned for unconsciously overrating and overstating the evidence in its favour; but a subsequent writer whose declared purpose it is to weigh opinions against one another, shows a distinct lack of the

long after the death of James, so that with this buttress the evidence of the Acts stands firm in the Author's estimation.

sense for historical evidence, when he conveys to the unwary reader such a mistaken impression of George the Sinful's intention in quoting Papias; and leaves it to the student to verify the reference and discover for himself that the ancient authorities say the opposite of what they are represented as implying. That is all in "the fearless old fashion" of the Tübingen school and of the later nineteenth century critics in dealing with inconvenient historical evidence. It was customary with them; but it is not permitted in the twentieth century.

We cannot here acquit Dr. Moffatt of misrepresenting evidence (unintentionally, and only through his defective historical sense), when he persistently talks of "the Papias-tradition". This so-called "Papias-tradition" is an invention of wild and undisciplined hypothesis, rejected not only by Lightfoot, but also by Harnack, Zahn, etc. Would Eusebius have been so confident, if Papias had been dead against him? Would the unvarying tradition of that period have been so unvarying, if Papias had recorded the early death of John? In all

probability, we must conclude, the real Papias agreed with Eusebius and the rest.

Dr. Moffatt on page 614 declares that the tradition so unhesitatingly declared in the fourth century by Eusebius, who knew and valued Papias, is contrary to Papias's testimony and is the invention of a later age, beginning with Irenaeus in the later second century. Eusebius is simply and plainly our best historical authority; he states clearly in almost every dubious case the grounds on which his statements rest; and he has a sound conception of the difference between what is probable, what is possible, and what is reasonably certain—a conception in which some of our great modern scholars are greatly lacking. John XXI. 22 implies a very early belief. Irenaeus represents the faith and testimony of Polycarp, who died 155-166 A.D., at the age of 86.

All this, however, is as nought in Dr. Moffatt's eyes compared with the silence of Clemens Romanus, Ignatius and Hegesippus: their "silence cannot fairly be called accidental".

The argument from silence can be used to

prove almost anything that the wild theorist about history imagines. It is almost too futile to detain us; yet one must give a few words to this aspect of the matter.

On page 614, Dr. Moffatt lays much stress on the silence of Clemens; yet on page 613 he says: "the silence of Clemens Romanus . . . is of minor importance; there was no particular occasion for him to mention the Apostle, and his evidence hardly tells either way". Then in a footnote he draws back in some degree from what he has said in the text. Why will writers who state one view in the text express doubt about it in a footnote? This is an abuse of the too convenient purpose of notes, and is peculiarly unsuitable in an "Introduction". Clemens was not writing a history; he was warning the Corinthians about a matter on which the residence of John in Asia had no bearing. Why should he or Ignatius be interpreted as bound to satisfy our historical doubts? They had enough to do with the pressing questions of the moment. The text of page 613 is right.

"Much more significant," says Dr. Moffatt on

page 613 f., "is the silence of Ignatius, especially when it is admitted that he knew the Fourth Gospel." We turn, as he bids us, to page 577 f., and find that there in his larger type he states: "The conceptions of Ignatius have been held to imply rather an acquaintance with the general ideas which reappear in special guise in the Fourth Gospel and the First Epistle of John, than any literary relationship".

Here again the Author's remarks in small type express doubts about what he says in the larger text. Often you cannot tell when you have nailed down Dr. Moffatt to a definite statement. The distinction between the use of large and of small type, as I have always understood, lies in this, that the important and fundamental principles are printed in large type, the secondary in small; but Dr. Moffatt uses the two kinds to set against one another his expressions of different views; and on page 613 f. he refers us to page 577 f., as if the small type were the important. We must not here enter on the question whether Ignatius was, or was not, built up on the writings of John. He could hardly be a

disciple of that Gospel, without being built up on it. It is a Gospel that seizes hold of those to whom it appeals; it is the arresting and the final expression of the Christian truth.

One question alone is needed. Does Ignatius, in writing to the Ephesians, lay any stress on the long residence of Paul among them? He mentions that they "are associates in the mysteries with Paul (*συμμύσται*)". This could not necessarily be taken as proof of his residence among them; for it might be argued, not without some force, that it is the death of Paul in Rome which prompts the reference, and not the residence of Paul in Ephesus. Still I personally would take *Symmystai* in the strictest sense of those who partook along with Paul of the Eucharist. Though hardly any person was alive who had so partaken, yet the Church of Ephesus was still living and had been "initiated along with Paul". It was however the Roman death of Paul after being dragged from Asia that gives point to the mention of the Apostle, and not his Asian residence. The idea of

"sharers with Paul in the mystery of a bloody death" is not absent from Ignatius's mind.

Ignatius, like Avircius Marcellus in the following century, travelled "holding Paul in his hands": he followed, and Faith went in front guiding his steps and making ready for him everywhere the Divine food. To "Paul" and "the Apostles" Ignatius makes his appeal in addressing the Ephesians; that this is inconsistent with, or has any bearing on, a residence of John in Asia, I have yet to learn.

As to Hegesippus, the reasoning is too absurd. Eusebius quotes "the current account of the ancients among us" as authority for the long life of John the Apostle. That this excludes Hegesippus, the earliest Christian historian, is an inference of the wildest character. To expect, however, that Hegesippus with his known bent and interest should lay stress on the work of John in the Province Asia is to expect too much. The truth is, after all, that we know extremely little about Hegesippus, that he is hardly more than a name to us, except in so far as Eusebius preserves his memory, and to assume that

Eusebius tacitly ignores and contradicts the testimony (silent or expressed) of Hegesippus, is false to historic evaluation of authorities.

Here, as always, Dr. Moffatt's intention evidently is to be scrupulously accurate in stating evidence and opinions. He mentions that Lightfoot, Zahn, Harnack, and many others, differ from him and suggest a different form for the statement of Papias, the true content of which after all is unknown, a matter of conjecture and quite uncertain. What one feels is that the author lacks the modern spirit, which tends naturally to state the conditions accurately. So, for example, in discussing briefly the Saviour's prediction that the brothers James and John would drink the same cup and be baptized with the same baptism as Himself, he does not state quite fairly the view which has been held by some modern scholars.[1] As this is a matter that involves several important principles, it deserves careful consideration.

[1] P. 603, note ‡, "It is impossible, with Godet, Gutjahr and others, to minimise *ἀνηρέθη*, here or in Georgios, into injury or exile",

When the mother of James and John came to Jesus with her two sons, "asking a certain thing of Him," viz., "that these my two sons may sit, one on Thy right hand, and one on Thy left hand, in Thy kingdom," the Saviour put the question to them: "Are ye able to drink the cup that I drink, or to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?"[1] Then, on their replying that they were able, He gave them the promise, "The cup that I drink ye shall drink, and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized": more He could not promise.

According to Dr. Moffatt and those scholars whom he follows in this place, these words constitute a definite and plain and absolute assertion or prophecy that James and John should die at the hand of the Jews in the same fashion as their Master died. Nothing that falls in any degree short of that perfect parallel will content these critics. Not that they all regard the words of Jesus as having been in every case

[1] I purposely unite the accounts given in Matthew xx. 20 ff. and Mark x. 35 ff.

fulfilled, or that they all consider this particular saying to have been uttered by Him and faithfully recorded. They are, however, all agreed in thinking that these words must necessarily have been fulfilled in the most literal sense in which a captious critic can take them, because either, on the one hand, if Jesus really spoke the words and they had not been literally fulfilled, they would have been studiously obliterated from the record and from the memory of the Church; or, on the other hand, if, as some of the critics would maintain, they were not spoken by Jesus but only invented by the Church later, the sole motive for the invention lay in the occurrence of the facts and the desire to represent Jesus as foretelling what did actually happen.

In this narrow and hard way of reading the Gospels serious inferences would follow from those words: James and John must have been killed by the Jews after the same fashion as the Saviour, and (as some of the critics even think) both about the same time and in the same way as each other. It would also follow that neither the Revelation nor the Fourth Gospel nor the

Epistles could be written by John, for those works are confessedly later than the time when, according to these theorists, the two Apostles died.

With this method of understanding the Gospels and reasoning from them I find myself in absolute disagreement.

If the second and easier alternative be taken, and if the so-called prophecy of Jesus was simply invented by "the growing consciousness of the Church" for the purpose of being put in the mouth of Jesus, the case would be ended. The "prophecy" would then be merely the subsequent record of what had actually occurred before the "prophetic" announcement was composed. If the invention of legend had gone to such an extreme as this, involving such a tremendous falsification of history—what Dr. Moffatt on page 603 calls "a tissue of historical difficulties"—there would remain nothing worth contending for. Nothing would be left for the historian, as distinguished from the critic, except to consign the whole of these documents to the limbo of lies, to which belong the Alex-

ander-legends and the history of Virgil the magician. With these history has nothing to do.

I do not, however, understand that Dr. Moffatt goes so far as this, but believe that he is ready to treat the saying Mark x. 39, Matthew xx. 23, as one which Jesus uttered, and which Luke did not record. I take it that the Author adopts the first of the only two alternatives, which are open from his point of view. We are then brought face to face with what appears to me to be the false and groundless idea that, after they had once found a place in the record, sayings of Jesus and of the Apostles would be erased from it and consigned to oblivion, merely because they did not find a literal fulfilment.

These sayings, however, were remembered simply because they were spoken and had deeply impressed some influential authority, and not because they were afterwards found to be prophetic. They were remembered on account of their force and weight and dignity, often without being fully comprehended by the audi-

ence or the readers. In many cases the disciples came to recognize in later years that they had misconceived, or understood in too narrow a sense, the Saviour's words. They did not sit in judgment on them, and decide that some had failed and must be eliminated from the record, while others had proved trustworthy and should be kept in memory. That whole idea is grotesque.

Prophecy is a statement of great principles and eternal truths in their application to the world. We should have imagined that Dr. Moffatt would be one of the last people to assume that a saying like this ought ever to be taken as a literal, hard-and-fast prediction of details. We have always understood that he treated the writings of the prophets after a more spiritual fashion; but in this case the temptation to buttress a bad theory leads him astray, and makes him forget what I believe to be his own principles. The character of James and of John, as Jesus saw, would carry them far on the same road that He was taking. They would never shrink. They would persevere to the end. This was

the reward that Jesus could read in their mind, and guarantee to them. He that overcometh I will make him a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go out thence no more;[1] "but to sit on my right hand or on my left hand is not mine to give". Jesus was not foretelling "times and seasons," nor portraying the literal facts of the life and death of two leading spirits among His disciples. It was not for the disciples to know such matters, nor to waste time on them. All such kind of thought, all such views of the world, are unworthy. "Not until a prophecy is fulfilled is its explanation found."[2] The development of character, and its outcome in the lives of James and John, were what Jesus expressed in the words, "the cup that I drink ye shall drink".

Throughout Dr. Moffatt's book there is nothing more soulless and external than his interpretation of these words.

[1] Rev. III. 12.

[2] Dr. Johannes Lepsius in "Expositor," February, 1911, p. 167, and the present writer's remarks on the same subject, pp. 160-163.

The author of the Revelation, whom I believe to be John, claimed to stand side by side with his Churches in enduring the extremest pains of persecution. As they were suffering at the hands of Domitian, so he was suffering. We are not left to infer this from a general argument or from mere subjective inference. John says this in so many words, Revelation 1. 9; and I cannot but feel that in those words he has in mind the prediction of Jesus: he was drinking the cup of persecution to the full, though in a somewhat different form. He declares that he was the brother of his suffering Churches and sharer with them in persecution, and that he was in Patmos for the *martyria* of Jesus. Gutjahr, Godet, etc., consider that this suffering may be reckoned as a sufficient fulfilment of the Saviour's prediction. Dr. Moffatt replies that "it is impossible to minimize" the words of the ancient record, "into injury or exile". But the punishment which John suffered in Patmos[1] was much worse than

[1] ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἀνῃρέθη (ἀνῃρέθησαν) is the expression in which George and the epitomizer of Philippus Sidetes, the only two ancient authorities, agree. It is probable, but by no means certain, that they took the three words from

"injury or exile". The milder forms of exile were reserved for Roman citizens and persons of rank. An obscure Jew in an Asian town, treated as Christians regularly were treated, was not condemned to any such mild deportation as this.

John's penalty was hard labour of some kind;[1] it was preceded by severe beating, it was accompanied by perpetual fetters, scanty clothing, insufficient food, sleep on the bare ground in a dark prison, and work under the lash of military overseers. It was reckoned the severest penalty short of death. It was inflicted on criminals of the humbler classes, on provincials and on slaves. As it was almost equivalent to death, the infliction of it was reserved for the supreme Governor of the province, the Proconsul of Asia; even his *legati* were not authorized to condemn a criminal to death or the mines.[2]

Papias. What was the context in Papias remains utterly obscure.

[1] I refer generally to Mommsen's chapter on this punishment in his "Römisches Strafrecht," p. 949 f.

[2] The proconsul had the power of life and death (*ius gladii*): even his three *legati* had not that right (Mom-

Finally, this penalty was very frequently inflicted on Christians; and the quarries, such as Prokonessos, were full of Christians. When John says that he in Patmos was suffering along with his suffering churches, among whom the sword was raging, his words are to be taken in their fullest sense: they were all being treated with almost equally severe penalties. There is, therefore, no minimizing in the suggestion of Gutjahr and the others that John's penalty in Patmos was a full and sufficient fulfilment of the prediction in the sense in which with prophetic insight it was made.

As George says, John was released by Nerva the successor of Domitian; Domitian's acts were invalidated at his death, and a release of those Christians who had been sent to the mines under his tyranny is not improbable. This would fully explain why John, though condemned to life-long suffering of the most terrible kind, and therefore in the fullest sense sharer in

msen, *loc. cit.*, p. 949, n. ‡), though they otherwise exercised his full authority, as his representatives in districts of the Province of Asia,

the same cup and baptized with the same baptism as Jesus, did after all escape death and return to Ephesus. He had gone through the pains and conquered the terrors of death, and yet he lived again.

VII. The Supposed Early Death of John.

Both Philip of Side[1] and George the Sinful say that John was slain by the Jews, and their agreement shows that Papias, whom they quote as authority, must have said either this or something which suggested this to them. They were both eager to make the agreement with the prediction, as they understood it, as close as possible, and they understood that, like Jesus, James and John must have been delivered to death by the Jews. We know too little about the circumstances in which James was slain, or those in which John suffered banishment, to judge whether, and how far, the agency of the Jews operated in either case. The death of James, inflicted by Herod, pleased the Jews (Acts xii. 3). Whether the persecution had

[1] Or rather a fragment understood to be the work of a late epitomizer of Philip.

been in any way suggested by them we do not know. George and Philip may have been right or not, we cannot judge. It should not be assumed, however, that the same exact words in which they agree were used by Papias. There was, in addition to the words of Papias, another force acting on them, viz., the prediction.[1] When James was killed by Herod, it pleased the Jews; and it may very well be that Papias said something of the same kind regarding the punishment of John. It is not necessary to suppose that Philip and George understood Papias correctly and reproduce his testimony exactly. George quotes Origen on the same subject; and, as we possess Origen's words, we are able to see that George misunderstood him.

This is all, of course, mere speculation and possibility, Lightfoot in his reply to "Supernatural Religion" makes a different suggestion in order to restore the real evidence of Papias—a suggestion which is not in any way inconsistent with what we have just said. The truth is that the two references to Papias are so slight

[1] The same force, doubtless, acted on Papias.

and vague, and so encompassed with inaccuracies in the context, that one can only speculate about what Papias said or meant. What is important to observe is that it is on the strength of a mere speculation that Dr. Moffatt and the modern critics whom he follows build up their empty and untrustworthy theory that John was killed by the Jews at some early time in the history of the congregation in Jerusalem. Such people as George the Sinner and the late epitomizer of Philip of Side are absolutely valueless authorities; yet Irenaeus and Eusebius must forsooth be set aside as mistaken in order to make room for these worthless and inaccurate scribblers of late time; and the theory is supported by equally vague combinations of even more worthless evidence selected from the worst side of the Martyrologies,[1] and by a needlessly

[1] That John and James, who were certainly (as the Author allows) not slain at the same time, should be commemorated together, is the flimsiest conceivable evidence that John was killed early in Jerusalem. The bracketing together of the memory of Apostles who had some historical connexion in life, but none in death, must be regarded as the worst side, historically speaking, of the Martyrologies.

strained interpretation of a saying of Jesus. Dr. Moffatt probably would set little store by that saying, if there were not a possibility that it was invented by some anonymous editor after John's death, though he leaves open the hypothesis that it may be a real prophecy of Jesus.

If any writer on the opposite side had ventured to quote such worthless evidence, how he would have been laughed to scorn. Suppose

Who, except a man with a theory, could attach even the smallest value to the record that John and James were commemorated on 27 December, and Paul and Peter on 28 December? To speak of this as historical evidence shows a defective conception of what historical evidence is. On this subject I may refer to Dean Armitage Robinson's "Historical Character of St. John's Gospel," p. 64 f., where much is well said that needed to be said. A calendar of saints' days is like the map of a partly surveyed country: towns have to be put at some point, and so it is with commemorations. When the death is otherwise attested, the day is, or may be, a historical record. As to James, Herod allowed no interval of months between his death and Peter's, Acts XII. 1 ff. The date, Dec. 26, for Stephen is supported by that assigned for the conversion of Paul, and has therefore some probability. The two following days were given to the four great Apostles for reasons stated *loc. cit.*

that some ninth-century writer, full of inaccuracies and quite valueless in himself, agreed with an anonymous epitomizer of a poor fifth-century historian as to the correctness of some statement in the book of the Acts, and that this agreement had been quoted as proving the correctness of that statement, what value would any critic of any school have attributed to the proof? We all know that such corroborations are valueless. It is only when writers like these can be tortured into an argument which seems to disagree with the New Testament that they are quoted. Their agreement and their disagreement, real or apparent, are alike valueless, unless confirmed by better authorities.

VIII. The Fascination of the Second Century.

The words quoted from Dr. Moffatt, page 315, at the beginning of Section IV may perhaps be considered by some readers as a chance expression, over-emphasized by the author through a slip, and not to be regarded as a fair specimen of the necessary and consciously deliberate tendency of his mind. Had that been so, I would not have quoted them. My intention has been to make only typical quotations, and to bring out what is the real character of Dr. Moffatt's position. He does fully mean all that he says. He sacrifices everything that is most striking and powerful in a whole period, and one of the greatest periods, of the world's literature; with the literature he sacrifices all the personalities, all the great men except

Paul;[1] and he gives us instead of them a succession of shadowy anonymous "editors," who worked up in successive layers by laborious processes a series of writings, which were to delude the world for seventeen or eighteen centuries into a belief that there existed a series of great men moving the world and changing history and stamping their personality on human memory, all of them a fantasy of prejudiced misinterpretation of an artificial literature. That is what Dr. Moffatt asks a rational man to accept. It is irrational and impertinent to set before us such a pretence of investigation into literature on its historical side.

The end of the second century exercises a strange fascination on Dr. Moffatt. He thinks, one might almost say, in terms of the late second century. He tries to look at and interpret the New Testament too much as the writers of that period looked at it. This leads him to a strange and unnatural point of view, which is true neither to the second nor to the first century,

[1] Peter is not an exception: see the subsequent Section on First Peter.

and which is especially noticeable in his treatment of the Pastoral Epistles. It is on that account that he finds the author of these Epistles "indifferent to such cardinal truths of his [Paul's] gospel as the fatherhood of God, the believing man's union with Jesus Christ, the power and witness of the Spirit, the spiritual resurrection from the death of sin, the freedom from the law, and reconciliation".

I do not find any real proof of this supposed indifference. In the opening of all three Epistles, "God Father" has become a fixed epithet, almost stereotyped, and has lost the article. One might say that this fixedness was not attained by Paul; that it is the sign of a kind of orthodoxy later than him; but at least it does not betray indifference to the Fatherhood of God. Moreover, no one can seriously say that "God Father" is too stereotyped for Paul, because he uses it regularly in his earlier letters.

One might go over Dr. Moffatt's list of omissions, and show how blind he is to the real implication of the Pastorals; but I must here content myself with referring him, for example,

to Titus III. 4 ff., and the words of Dr. Denney (who does not think that Paul wrote these Epistles): "St. Paul could, no doubt, have said all this, but probably he would have said it otherwise and not all at a time".

The Pastoral Epistles give much more definite and sharp expression to certain doctrines, and thus were nearer to the late second century point of view; they were therefore eagerly seized upon in that period, and the earlier Epistles were interpreted in accordance with them by an age which was no longer able to understand Paul. The earlier Epistles were the first to be rescued from the traditional misinterpretation, because they are most glaringly dissonant from it; and now the process has to be repeated in inverse order, and the Pastorals have to be interpreted afresh in accordance with the earlier Epistles. It will then be found that Dr. Denney's words require to have a reference to time inserted, and ought to be read: "he would [at the period when he wrote Romans and Colossians, etc.] have said it otherwise".

IX. The Argument from Accuracy of Local Details.

Dr. Moffatt admits that the Fourth Gospel contains much local knowledge and circumstantial detail, but denies that the presence of these "can suffice to prove that the author had been a Palestinian apostle" (which no one would affirm without much more evidence). All that one can infer is that, so far as this kind of evidence goes, he knew Palestine well. The Author asserts that "literary annals abound with cases of an imaginative historical reconstruction, where the author is known to have had no direct acquaintance with the countries in which his scenes are laid". His cases are all taken from modern literature.

In the first place, however, he neglects to observe that this seeking after correct historical reconstruction is a modern development, and is

wholly unknown and undreamed of in ancient time. Moreover, if the supposed Asia Minor author (or authors) of the Fourth Gospel had set about the task of reading up Palestinian geography and custom with the view of imparting local colour and verisimilitude to the book, he would have done not merely what no other among the ancients ever thought of, and what was not demanded by the literary canons of his time: he would also have been guilty of deliberate and conscious simulation of a false personality. In seeking to impart this local colour so as to give to the book the appearance of having been written by a native of Palestine, he would show an anxiety to pretend that some Palestinian Jew had written the book. Thus all the naturalness and unconscious honesty which are claimed for the anonymous author (or authors) are sacrificed, and he is degraded to the rank of a conscious and deliberate forger. Dr. Moffatt does not, however, think he was a forger, but that he was acting from high motives and with unfeigned truth.

In the second place, even as regards modern

times, I should desiderate much more proof than Dr. Moffatt offers that successful "imaginative historical reconstruction" in respect of geographical detail is so common as he asserts. I have not found it in those cases where I am capable of judging. Let us take Dr. Moffatt's examples one by one: "'Gil Blas de Santillane,' for all its masterly delineation of Spanish manners, was composed by a man who had never been in Spain". I have not been in Spain, and am unable to judge how far there is exhibited any proofs of such geographical accuracy about minute details as is found in the Fourth Gospel; but I do know that people are very apt to take and repeat such assertions on credit without any first-hand knowledge of the subject. It is also certain that, if Le Sage shows such local accuracy, he must have studied carefully before he became able to impart it to his book. But Dr. Moffatt asserts only that he gives us a "masterly delineation of Spanish manners". How far is this delineation his own? How far is it taken from the Spanish author whose ideas and plan he adopted, and

from whom he borrowed some of the adventures which his hero meets with? How far is it due to acquaintance with Spaniards in France, and with the typical Spaniard of literature (as in "Don Quixote"), a strongly marked figure easily imitated by a writer so skilful as Le Sage? There are many questions to put and to answer before the argument from "Gil Blas" can be admitted to have even the remotest bearing on the Fourth Gospel.

Dr. Moffatt next mentions Shakespeare's Italian plays. In every case Shakespeare had an Italian story to work on: he took a printed tale, and gave it dramatic form: he was aided by his knowledge of many other Italian stories and of Italian history. Moreover, Shakespeare is an exceptional genius, and it is not a fair argument that, because he could do something, therefore the anonymous writer (or writers) who made up the Fourth Gospel, but who impressed his own contemporaries so little that he was not remembered or even noticed by them, must have been able to do all that Shakespeare did. And then is Shakespeare so accurate in minute

geographical detail as the Fourth Gospel is? I know no proof of this, and should be glad to learn from Dr. Moffatt. What about the sea-coast of Bohemia?

Defoe is Dr. Moffatt's third example. I have not been in Robinson Crusoe's island, and cannot therefore judge of his geographical accuracy; but so far as I can remember from time long past the character of his stories, he is most accurate where he has personal knowledge of the situation and localities; and he deliberately set himself to work up an imitation of true fact and life. He was not trying to teach the world; he was trying to cheat the world into believing that his stories were true. He pretends and says that they were true. There is no analogy between his method and Dr. Moffatt's theory of the making up of the New Testament books, unless he admits that the writer of the Fourth Gospel was a conscious and intentional forger after the style in which Defoe deliberately palmed off invented stories as true.

This subject is a big one and is not to be lightly dismissed, as Dr. Moffatt dismisses it,

with a few remote, insufficient and uncertain analogies. His treatment of it is audaciously light and trivial. Why does he not take some reasonably analogous case that can be tested and proved? Is it because there are none that suit his argument? Take the case of Walter Scott. Here you have an author who is admittedly one of the most correct of romance writers. You find him marvellously accurate in the Border country, where he was thoroughly at home: not quite so minutely accurate in Argyleshire and the north or central Highlands, but still very accurate: in "The Antiquary," the scene of which lies in Forfarshire, he makes the sun set in the North Sea: in "The Heart of Midlothian" he alludes to Roseneath as an island: in "The Pirate" he drew some geographical colour from experience on a voyage among the Orkney and the Shetland Islands:[1] in England he is much less vividly accurate in geographical detail: in Switzerland "Anne of Geierstein" is

[1] My friend Professor H. J. C. Grierson, who knows the Shetlands well, for the Fitful Head forms part of his family property, tells me that there are in "The Pirate" numerous geographical slips.

admittedly and demonstrably inaccurate: in "Count Robert of Paris" and in "The Talisman" there is the minimum of local colour or detail.

I add a quotation, bearing on this subject, from a great authority. Ranke's "course had been determined, in early life, by 'Quentin Durward'. The shock of the discovery that Scott's Lewis the Eleventh was inconsistent with the original in Commynes made him resolve that his object thenceforth should be above all things to follow without swerving, and in stern subordination and surrender, the lead of his authorities." I quote from Lord Acton's Inaugural Lecture at Cambridge in "Lectures on Modern History," p. 19.

Is not Dr. Moffatt confusing between the artistic ability to give a vivid impression of imaginative reality, and the possession of real geographical knowledge of details that can be tried and demonstrated? Could Shakespeare's foreign scenes stand being tested in that prosaic way by the map? Dr. Moffatt knows very well that they could not. Deduct from them what

belongs to universal human nature, and how much remains of the specifically and characteristically Italian? The sea-coast of Bohemia is the scene of as true, human, real, vivid life and action as Venice or Padua or London; and that is all that the poet sought.

This paragraph in Dr. Moffatt's book is simply a caricature of historical reality and a travesty of historical argument.

X. Examples of the "Imaginative Reconstruction" of the Past in Literature.

It would be an interesting task, and one not devoid of usefulness, to take a modern romance and go through it carefully, noting the marks of ignorance or carelessness and the signs of accuracy in the narrative whose scene lies in an age and a country not personally known to the writer, and trying to trace the reasons for the varying accuracy and inaccuracy. Space does not permit this here: but every critic of every school and kind, who is going to talk about "imaginative historical reconstruction" in regard to the Fourth Gospel, ought to begin by making for himself a thorough study of this kind from first-hand knowledge, and not to content himself with borrowed *dicta*, imperfectly understood.

Scott's "Count Robert" is an instructive ex-

ample: one can trace varying degrees of accuracy in parts, and see the reasons in most cases. The Prison-of-Anemas scene is well done, whereas the Crusaders crossing the tideless Bosphorus are said to go upstream first in order to take advantage of the turn of the tide. Here one sees the process of truth and of error. One can detect the way in which Scott was misled by a reference in one of his authorities to the varying strength and course of the currents in the Bosphorus.[1] He hastily applies his own experience of tidal seas and rivers, and thus invents a tide for the tideless salt-water river that flows from the Black Sea past Constantinople and Scutari. Where he closely follows a literary model he is best: where he trusts to his imagination he is worst.

Another example can be found in Marion Crawford's "Via Crucis". The description of

[1] One can see any day boats, and even small steamers, doing what the Crusaders did, starting off upstream and at a particular point turning outwards into the current, which carries them towards the Asiatic side. I have had the experience in a boat, unintentionally testing the truth of the account.

the march of the Crusaders in 1146, headed by Louis of France, is founded on an excellent narrative written by an eye-witness, perhaps on more than one narrative; but the writer of the romance is concerned much more with the imaginary career of his hero than with local details, and these are almost wholly omitted, except in the great scene of the Turkish assault on the French army in the pass towards Pisidia. More than twenty years ago, when first I read the account of the assault, as written down by one of the Crusaders, I immediately recognized the exact locality, a little way south-east from Denizli in a long pass which I have several times traversed; but recently, when I read the modern novelist's account of the same incident, I could gather from it nothing local except that his description of the place bore no resemblance to any pass that I had ever seen. Yet it is quite possible that some Western scholar may hereafter quote the whole episode of that march in "Via Crucis" as an admirable "imaginative reconstruction of history"; and indeed it deserves in some respects to be called so; but still

the topography is vague, or when not vague is inaccurate.

The novelist also omits that most striking episode when the Crusaders crossed the deep Maeander in the face of a Turkish army and scattered the opposing forces on the other bank. As I read, I wondered why he omits that episode, which is so pertinent to his main purpose of glorifying "the Guide of Aquitaine" (the Guide might have been described as finding the solitary point on that difficult river where this most gallant feat of arms was possible), if Marion Crawford had known by experience the nature of the country, and had not perhaps got confused between the two Maeanders, which the French Crusaders crossed successively—the Maeander (ancient Caystros) at Ephesus, and the true Maeander where the feat was performed. Still the novelist had to select and omit, and he cannot be blamed for making his own choice.

The criticism of "John Inglesant" by Lord Acton[1] may be mentioned in illustration. It

[1] "Letters to Mary Gladstone," pp. 135-49. I am indebted for this and the previous quotation from Lord Acton to the Rev. W. Fiddian Moulton.

fills fifteen pages of his "Letters". The writer prefaces it with the statement that "I have read nothing more thoughtful and suggestive since 'Middlemarch,' and I could fill with honest praise the pages I am going to blacken with complaint. . . . Not having (access to the author), I submit my questionings to yourself." "John Inglesant" was generally lauded as a marvel of "imaginative historical reconstruction"; yet to a master like Lord Acton it seems on a single rapid reading to be full of historical errors in details, or at least of matters that roused his suspicion. I am not qualified to express an opinion, but have been accustomed to regard the critic as a master of historical knowledge; and no one would question a dictum of his without very careful investigation. In respect of historical details he finds several scores of faults. As to geographical matters he mentions that "the steps of the Trinita were hardly built then," and again "there are no spires in Rome. I hear that the author has never been in Italy. That accounts for many topographical mistakes, and

leaves a margin to his credit." So difficult does Lord Acton consider it to attain accuracy in such details, when one has never visited the country about which one writes, that he pardons such instances of incorrectness as inevitable. But "these little (topographical) scruples by themselves do not build up a strong misgiving. The picture may be true in spite of slips in accessory detail. But is the picture true, I will not say controversially, but historically? There are glaring faults in it, not open to dispute or controversy."

There is no question, then, whether the author of "John Inglesant" preserved topographical truth. That was impossible for one who did not know Italy familiarly, however much he strove after it. The only question for Lord Acton is about the many historical errors, which the critic enumerates, finishing up with "I must stop somewhere".[1]

Now Dr. Moffatt admits that the Gospel of John contains many proofs of minute local knowledge of Palestine; but contends that

[1] The quotations are from pp. 137 and 147.

accurate "historical reconstruction" is quite a usual thing in literature. One must doubt whether he ever attained to the finer knowledge that would justify him in expressing an opinion about this aspect of either ancient or modern books. His knowledge, though astonishingly wide, is not of that order; but he picks out statements convenient for his purpose and his strong bias, wherever he finds them. He does not sift or criticize them; he simply quotes them, as if they were sufficient and final.

That the Author of the Fourth Gospel knew Palestine well is generally admitted. Many attempts have been made to convict him of slips even in the most minute details of topography (such as Lord Acton almost wholly omits from his criticism of "John Inglesant," because the writer could not be expected to avoid them); but according to Dr. Moffatt those attempts have failed, and the local accuracy is admitted. From this we are bound to infer that the writer of the Fourth Gospel knew Palestine quite intimately. This is not sufficient to prove that he was an Apostle; but it carries us along part

of the way, and proves that he was not an ordinary Asian Jew. We must not infer too much, mindful that in respect of local topography the legend of Judith and Holofernes is very accurate; but we can at least say that the writer of that legend knew well and familiarly one district of Palestine.

We may, however, at least ask whether Dr. Moffatt has proved, or even presented any moderate amount of evidence in favour of his very confident assertion.

Again, the legend of the Periodoi of Barnabas gives a most elaborate and minutely accurate list of places and times on the Apostle's voyage from Syria to Cyprus.[1] What are we

[1] Lipsius in his work on the New Testament Apocrypha draws, on the whole, the correct inferences as to this legend from geographical data; yet he is extraordinarily far from the real facts about the route of the voyage. He judges, therefore, simply from the minuteness and carefulness of the local detail, assuming that it is all right, though his attempt to place it is for the most part wrong. I wrote a long study of the geographical part of this legend many years ago, but the time needed to print it has never fallen to my lot. It is worthy of note that Lipsius might have been deceived by invented details about this obscure

to infer from this? Certainly not that the legend is historical, but only that the voyage is described according to the real experience and knowledge of the Author. He was therefore either a writer of a pure romance, intended to interest and amuse a Cypriote public by the description of places and circumstances known to them, and naturally describing correctly those geographical features that he was familiar with, or a deliberate forger who used his personal familiarity with localities to obtain credence for a story designed to gain some end, whether hortatory or otherwise. The further fact that he shows ignorance in geography outside of Cyprus and the Syrian voyage proves that he belonged to this part of the world. There is, at any rate, practical certainty that personal knowledge of the ports (some so obscure that their names are known only in the very minute

coast, if there had been a series of false names in the legend. The critic needs knowledge. Lipsius practically assumes topographical honesty and knowledge on the part of the writer of that legend; and through this assumption he is led aright.

study of that coast,[1] one having been re-discovered recently by Bent and Bishop Hicks through comparison between an inscription and Stephanus Byzantinus) is involved in this legend, and that "imaginative reconstruction of history" by a native of a remote country has here played no part. Personal knowledge alone gives the power to tell a story involving many local details without betraying ignorance to one who knows the localities.

The Fourth Gospel shows great accuracy in local details, as Dr. Moffatt acknowledges freely on the testimony of many persons who have known the country, and who have investigated and scrutinized most minutely and critically this feature of the book. Therefore all analogy known to me tends to prove that the Fourth Gospel cannot have been written at a

[1] It is through his want of such minute knowledge that Lipsius went so far wrong in his account of the voyage; he looked into the subject only for the purpose of criticizing the legend, and not for the sake of knowing the topography thoroughly (the same procedure that is usual with New Testament scholars in talking about Pauline journeys).

later time by a Jewish native of the province Asia, who restored by an effort of "imaginative reconstruction of history" the features and surroundings of an unknown past, for the purpose of elaborating an imaginary figure of the Saviour as it was gradually evolved in the growing "consciousness of the Church". That, I think, is a fair statement of Dr. Moffatt's theory; and the theory seems, as we have said, to be impossible.

There are only three hypotheses which analogy and literary possibilities leave open. (1) The Fourth Gospel was written by some person who knew the events and the localities so intimately that he naturally and without conscious effort described everything correctly in its actual surroundings. (2) The Fourth Gospel is the composition of some person who, belonging to Palestine by birth and upbringing, composed a romance to interest and please the later Christian public without intending it to be taken as more than a fictitious romance, and who naturally and unconsciously described correctly the local conditions: the conscious straining after local

verisimilitude in such a romance by a foreigner was unknown to that age and undreamed of then, and not required by the literary standards of the period. (3) The Fourth Gospel was composed at a later time with the intention of moving and affecting the contemporary Church in the situation in which it was placed: the composer was profoundly sensible of the grave needs of the time, and he tried to put things right by a work in which he described the life of the Saviour as it had come to be conceived by the "growing consciousness of the Church": in order to give effectiveness and authority to his work he pretended that it had been written by an eye-witness who had seen and known what he described—that process Dr. Moffatt defends on the ground that it was considered entirely justifiable and right by this "growing consciousness of the Church": this composer must have been so determined to gain unmerited credence for his composition that (somewhat after the fashion of the Asian Presbyter who composed the Acts of Paul and Thekla) he took much trouble and studied deeply and travelled

in the land of Palestine in order to impart to his work a local verisimilitude that should impose on people who knew the country—a device hitherto unknown to ancient literature; but the general character of the book stamps it as a work of the Province Asia composed for the use of Christians primarily in that province. This whole elaborate process was done so skilfully and successfully that it was immediately accepted as authoritative, and soon mistaken for the work of the Apostle John. Dr. Moffatt does not make it quite clear whether he thinks that the earliest users of the book (who, as he holds, did not regard it as the work of the Apostle John) knew it to be a composition which falsely pretended to be written by an eye-witness, and which was really the work of a later Asian composer, or whether he considers that those earliest users fancied it to be the work of some other eye-witness; but he strongly suggests by his general treatment that those first readers were in no respect deceived, and that they even approved of this falseness as a right and praiseworthy device.

The second of these hypotheses is not, and would not for a moment be, entertained by Dr. Moffatt. I doubt if he is prepared to accept the third, although he goes a very long way in that direction; but he wavers between the theory of growth or successive editing by different writers whose work cannot be disentangled, and a theory which approximates to this. The theory of growth and re-editing far from Palestine fails utterly to account for local accuracy in a Palestinian history. The theory which we have stated as (3) needs only to be stated in order to be rejected. I see no rational theory except the first.

XI. The Lawfulness of False Attribution in Literature.

Dr. Moffatt makes, on page 415, a reference to "the reasons which justified" the author of the Pastoral Epistles in pretending that they were the work of Paul. As he says "it is not necessary to spend words upon the reasons"; they have already been sufficiently discussed in the "Historical New Testament" and the "Encyclopædia Biblica". I do not wholly dissent from him as regards the difference between ancient and modern opinion about the propriety of writing a book under a revered name in order to gain authority for the teaching set forth therein. A pupil may have considered that he was expressing in his work the opinions of his master, and on that account may have from a mistaken but pious motive put forth the book in his master's name. That many works were com-

posed and published under false names is certain; but it is not made out that general Christian opinion approved of the attempt to gain Apostolic authority for a work of a later epoch by attributing it to the authorship of an Apostle. That, however, is what Dr. Moffatt strenuously asserts, and assumes to be proven. Almost all the examples which he gives in support of his assertion—an assertion confidently made by many modern writers—are open to serious question.

He says, for example, that Luke fabricated speeches and put them in the mouth of Peter and Paul; and therefore it is evident that Luke thought this procedure honest and right, and could not have objected to the false attribution of letters to those Apostles. Even if, for the moment, we admit that in the Acts Luke composed speeches and put them in the mouth of Peter and Paul, that is not an analogous case to fabricating a book or a letter and attributing it to an Apostle in order to give it a spurious authority in the Church. A historian might compose and put in the mouth of some histori-

cal figure a speech containing what he believed to be a good summary of the facts and thoughts which belonged to the situation. That procedure was approved by ancient feeling, and practised by the greatest historians. The historian of standing did not thereby seek to palm off his own views about the situation of his own time under another name: he tried to make the past situation clear and vivid to his readers by a dramatic device which was regarded at the time as right and proper.

Moreover, I venture to deny absolutely that Luke fabricated the speeches which he attributes to the Apostles; he had good authority for them, though, of course, he gives merely summaries and not verbatim reports; and summaries are necessarily coloured by the writer's style. The nearest exception which I should be inclined to admit is the speech in Acts I. 9 ff.: there the speech and the commentary on it pass into one another, and it appears that Luke had authority only for the general proposal but not for the details. He had no witness to rely on in this case; and he passes from the speech to

the comment and back again to the speech in a way which is quite different from his ordinary method. By this device he marks off the speech from his report of all others in the Acts.

The one certain example which Dr. Moffatt gives of a second century book attempting to gain credit by the use of Paul's name, and by the attribution to Paul of speeches that are entirely un-Pauline, is the Acts of Paul and Thekla, composed by an Asian presbyter; and the publication was disapproved by public sentiment, and punished by the degradation of the writer from the presbyterate. The presbyter pleaded that he had acted from love of Paul. Apparently he wished to add to Paul's glory by recording the Apostle's exploits and teaching; but the Church disapproved.

Dr. Moffatt, as it is only right to add, will have it that the presbyter was punished, not because he had falsely attributed to Paul acts and words, but only because these words were not in accordance with the doctrine of the Church. The testimony of Tertullian, however, seems to me certainly to imply that

the punishment was awarded because of the false attribution. Possibly that may have been a pretence, and the real reason may have been what Dr. Moffatt says; but even the pretence seems to imply a certain standard of public judgment unfavourable to false attribution. At that time the publication of opinions contrary to the right doctrine was certainly regarded as deserving of punishment: why should the authorities pretend that the punishment, which was deserved on this ground, had been inflicted for the other reason, viz., false attribution, if public opinion did not condemn such false attribution?

The question of false attribution requires fuller and more methodical treatment than it has yet received. It is usually treated by persons who have already formed the opinion that ancient opinion permitted every kind of false attribution. So far as I can judge, there is still an opening for the belief that early Christian opinion made distinctions: it would not condemn compositions such as the Epistle of Paul to the Laodiceans, where there is no intention to spread opinions

under the shelter of Pauline authority, but merely to compose an edifying and harmless literary exercise after the fashion of the schools; but the typical Christian judgment, as a general rule, did condemn the attempt seriously to mould public opinion and affect Church teaching under a false assumption of Apostolic authority. The arguments that have been used or may be used to support this latter view are left out of sight by Dr. Moffatt.

XII. The Growth of a Miracle.

From page 539 I quote a sentence or two that are fairly typical of the general tone of Dr. Moffatt's work. He is speaking of the raising of Lazarus and of the (to him) very suspicious silence of the other Gospels about "so stupendous and critical an episode"; and he says, "The miracle . . . is an illustration of the profound truth that Jesus is the source of life eternal in a dead world, and that the resurrection is not, as the popular faith of the Church imagined (John xi. 24), something which takes place at the last day, but the reception of Christ's living Spirit. . . . Whether more than this religious motive, operating on the Lucan material, is necessary to explain the story, remains one of the historical problems of the Gospel."

Then the Author quotes an explanation of

the way in which this false tale about Lazarus was probably concocted. "The whole evidence points strongly to the conclusion that the Evangelist, using some tradition to us unknown, and the Synoptic material mentioned, elaborated them freely into a narrative designed to be at once (*a*) an astounding manifestation of the Logos-Christ, (*b*) a pictorial setting forth of the spiritual truth of Christ as Life, (*c*) a prophetic prefiguration of the death and resurrection of Jesus" (Forbes, p. 273); and he continues: "It may be a miracle which, like that of Mark XI. 12 f. (see pp. 225, 236), has grown up mainly out of a parable—with hints from other Synoptic traditions, e.g. the raising of the widow's son at Nain (Luke VII. 11-17)—in this case the parable of Lazarus (Luke XVI. 19 ff.). . . . What historical nucleus lies behind the story, it is no longer possible to ascertain."

To the critical sense of the mere commonplace historian the idea of this "profound truth," which finds expression by being gradually built up into a fictitious tale on the faint basis of the slight material recorded by Luke, seems incred-

ible. Truth does not come out of a lie, or mould itself into a falsehood, except in the degeneration of intellect amidst unfavourable surroundings. Can the religion which has branded the lie as a grave sin have formed itself by means of a long series of false tales, and gained vitality by attributing its origin to a group of Apostles, who knew nothing and recorded nothing and believed nothing of those later inventions?

One remembers the story current among undergraduates when I was at college, to the effect that a dignitary of the Church, who is still living, said in a sermon delivered in Balliol College Chapel, "In these days when the tale of the Resurrection and the myths of the miracles are things of the past, let us be thankful that we can still cling to the great Christian verities". According to the story this was too strong even for the Master of that day, and the preacher ceased to preach in Balliol College.

"The great Christian verities" of 1870 have become "the profound truth" of 1911; but there is no essential difference between them.

As I read these words of Dr. Moffatt's, I feel myself back in the third decade of the nineteenth century. Dr. Moffatt seems (as has been said above) to work on the old lines, and to have made no real progress since he was a student at college; and he still employs the old-fashioned jargon which was taught at that time, some years later than the date of my story.

Presumably this process of building up a false tale about Lazarus is ranked by Dr. Moffatt in the same harmless and almost laudable category as the action of later writers in imparting influence and authority to their views by publishing them under the false name of an apostolic writer. To us, however, it looks undistinguishable from simple romance writing; it is wholly divorced from reality: it is a false story invented to convey a spiritual moral. It is not a myth, for myths grow up unconsciously and lie wholly in the realm of fancy. It approximates perilously near to deliberate and intentional falsification of history, for it relates wholly to persons otherwise known to be real figures (as Dr. Moffatt admits): both the actors and the specta-

tors are figures who appear frequently in the Gospels; and the narrator declares that he was an eye-witness of this and of the other incidents which he describes, that this and the other incidents made a profound impression on him, and that he records them in order "that ye may believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God" (xx. 21). The book is tremendously impressive, if it is the honest work of a man who had seen with his own eyes, who had during a long life dwelt in loving memory on certain times[1] and incidents in the life of the Christ whose disciple he had been, and who at last composed this record of the scenes which had most deeply impressed himself, in the conviction that they would impress others also and make them believe as he believed. If, on the other hand, it is the work of a man belonging

[1] As Principal Iverach points out, it is remarkable what a small number of separate days and occasions make up the Fourth Gospel: other times and days seem to fade or to be less impressed on his memory; and in his old age he lives in the recollection of the few days, at long intervals in Jesus's life, which had most deeply fixed themselves in his mind and affected his character.

to a later age and an alien country, who had seen none of the events that he describes, who invents some or many of them, without any real foundation but with merely an "historical nucleus" supplemented by the free play of creative fancy, who inserts little details which, if they do not spring from vivid memory of the scenes, can only be described as fabrications designed to convey to the readers a false impression of the lively recollection of the eye-witness (such as John XI. 30, 39, 44)—if all that is the case, then the book is the most cruel and heartless imposture that the world or the devil has ever produced. Its greatness, its supreme and unique position in the literature of the world, depends on its truth. That an Asian Jew (or a series of Asians) created an imaginary Jesus, whom he palmed off on his contemporaries as a solitary and unparalleled figure, the Divine nature walking among men, is from one point of view an interesting phenomenon; but the deception practised on a credulous public, the calculated falseness of the whole proceeding, seems to me to be revolting, and all the more

revolting because it was so successful. Its success implies great skill in gauging human nature and human credulity, and in choosing so coolly the cleverest means to deceive a people already disposed to accept Jesus as something greater than He in reality was; and on that account this Asian imposture degrades one's conception of human nature.

XIII. The "Growing Consciousness of the Church".

The Author's theory is a false application of the principle of development. He attempts to show that the essence of Christianity is a gradual development during the first century and the first decades of the second century through "the growing consciousness of the Church". This "growing consciousness" had no real historical ground to rest on. It created out of the historical and real Jesus an unhistorical and unreal one. In this theory I fail to find any historical or psychological possibility. That is not the way in which great events and great religious awakenings come into being. It is the moving force of some wonderful personality that makes the power of a new religion or of a religious revival. I can understand how the impulse given by the Jesus of the Fourth Gospel

and of the whole New Testament moved the world during the first century, and made those great personalities, such as John, Peter, Paul, and others, by imparting its power to them through their intense belief in what they had seen and known; and yet how they were not able to make in their turn a continuous succession of great personalities living on the same level to which their belief had raised them. The impulse seemed to die out, and yet did not die, but was able from time to time to move and to mould those great personalities who felt the spirit of Jesus, and kept the Church alive and progressive.

That historical process is to me intelligible; but I find no analogy to or justification for Dr. Moffatt's theory of a creative "consciousness of the Church," impersonal, working anonymously, hidden from the world behind false names for whom it created false personalities and incredible histories. How did this creative "consciousness" come into existence? Whence did it derive its force? Not from truth, because it makes falseness and loves concealment and

shrouds itself in mist. How and why did this "creative consciousness" come to an end? Or has it come to an end? It is all a phantasm, a fancy, a fiction, irrational and incredible.

The New Testament describes a "growing consciousness of the Church," but it is a totally different thing from that which Dr. Moffatt postulates. The Apostles, who had known Jesus without really knowing Him, gradually came later to recognize Him in His real character. Their eyes were opened, and they saw. That is a consciousness of the real meaning of real events. Dr. Moffatt dreams of a "consciousness" which falsely imagines events that never happened.

XIV. The Unity of the New Testament.

On page 9 Dr. Moffatt has some very just reflections of a general character on the method of studying the canon of the New Testament and its growth. He speaks of the danger which may arise from treating the writings of the New Testament apart from the rest of "the literature of primitive Christianity". The canon "represents a dogmatic selection from" that literature. "Is there not a danger," he asks, "of isolating the writings unhistorically under the influence of what was the postulate of a later generation?"

Here it appears that Dr. Moffatt is on his guard against the danger, which after all he has not escaped, of examining the writings of the New Testament too much from the point of view of the later age. He here warns us against

what elsewhere he in practice observes as right method. In an early section of the present article we quoted from page 8 his principle that one should select the later second century as giving the proper *coup d'œil* for studying the New Testament; and we have stated the opinion (1) that he carries out this principle in such a way and to such an extent as seriously to distort his view, (2) that it is a false principle. Now we see that on page 9 he states a different and better principle; and this is far from being the only case in which he varies from himself in successive paragraphs or successive pages.

Thus on page 9 the Author proceeds rightly to guard against a possible but wrong inference from the words which we have just quoted, viz., that "the unity of the New Testament is a purely factitious characteristic imposed upon its contents by the ecclesiastical interests of a subsequent age". In corroboration of this caution he aptly cites Dr. Denney, "Death of Christ," (pp. 1-4), and Dr. Sanday in Hastings' "Encyclop. of Religion" (ii. p. 576 f.). He then quotes at length the opinion of a distinguished German

scholar[1] that the canon of the New Testament includes all that was upon the whole of most value, oldest and most important in the literature of the early period. He protests, however, "against introducing *a priori* conceptions of unity and uniqueness into the historical criticism of the religious ideas and the literary form of the New Testament writings". All this is quite right and well said—said almost wholly in the words of others. There is a unity in the New Testament, but we must not hastily and without proper study form an *a priori* conception of what that unity is.

Yet in spite of this protest the only unity of which Dr. Moffatt takes any account in the New Testament is an *a priori* conception, viz., that which springs out of "the growing consciousness of the Church"; and he makes frequent and fatal use of this misinterpreted "consciousness". It supplies a convenient pseudo-explanation of almost all the most noteworthy phenomena; and it always implies an importation by the Church into the original and

[1] Wrede, "Ueber Aufgabe und Methode" etc., p. 11.

true history of ideas and pseudo-facts which were not contained there at first.

The Author's idea of the unity seems to be that it was imposed by the Church in order to make the New Testament what it now is; and he takes no account, so far as I have observed, of the real unity. One can and should, as he rightly holds, study each document apart and for itself, and one can and should also study the unity which he too finds running through the whole; but this unity is in his estimation not an internal unity springing from the natural development of the original idea and the original truth, an idea present in the historical facts from the beginning and gradually becoming clear to the great apostles as they lived and grew wise: it is an idea which grew through the invention or exaggeration of tales and the concoction of unhistorical legends about the Founder of the Church, and which found in this process of invention or exaggeration the means of expressing itself.

XV. Order and Unifying Principle in the New Testament.

The order in which the Author studies the books of the New Testament is on the whole right, as appears to us, though in details we differ much from him. To us, as to him, the New Testament begins from Paul and ends with John; but we place First Peter later, and Hebrews with Ephesians decidedly earlier than he does. His action in taking away Ephesians from Paul causes a loss; but this, though a serious, yet is not a fatal loss: because Paul still remains to us, the one man in the New Testament whom Dr. Moffatt allows us to keep. All the other great personalities, as he says himself, disappear, because their presentation to us in the documents is unhistorical and unreal, a figment of the "growing consciousness of the Church". The misplacement of Hebrews after

First Peter seems to cause almost a more serious loss than the taking away of Ephesians, because it distorts the perspective of a period. Still, so far as order goes, the main lines of study which the Author follows are profitable: and no man can as yet prove his own opinion about chronology and order in the New Testament to the satisfaction of other scholars.

It is only when we approach the unifying principle which runs through the whole series of books that I have to part company absolutely from Dr. Moffatt. Each of us recognizes the existence of such a unity; but the principle seems to me to lie in the progress towards more perfect recognition by the young and growing Church of the real nature and character and mission of Jesus, whereas to Dr. Moffatt it lies in the imposing on a real and very simple Jesus of an unreal and unhistorical nature and character and acts and words, and, above all, miracles.

There we are at the real *crux* of the whole matter. Often the disciples, as is several times said in the Gospels, did not at the time recognize the real meaning of Jesus's words. Later, as

they looked back over the past, they were aware of their own blindness. The progress lay in their own minds. To Dr. Moffatt this implies that they put into their memory of Jesus's words something that was not originally there, something that came from their "growing consciousness". To me it implies that the disciples were growing in power of thought and in width or depth of mind, so that they were able to understand sayings which had previously been far too great for their simple nature to comprehend. The meaning, and the vast sweep of thought, and the wide outlook over the world, and the penetrating insight into the nature of man and his relation to God and to the world, were in the words from the beginning.

Take any of the great sayings of Jesus from almost any page of the Gospels. How perfect they are, how complete in their comprehension of man and of God. There is nothing more left to say; all that remains to do is to understand the deep wisdom of those matchless and final statements: "Render unto Cæsar what is Cæsar's, and to God what is God's"—"The

Son of Man is lord also of the Sabbath"—and so on. Yet they are so simple in expression that one is easily led to overlook their greatness. They overturn and renovate the whole view-point of His contemporaries. They take side with none of the parties or schools. They remake the world. They put an end to the old. They begin the new. From them history and thought take a fresh start. They are the supreme concentration of wisdom expressed in words which a child can understand in part, but of which human thought can never exhaust and fully comprehend the scope.[1]

[1] I may venture to refer to a paragraph in an essay on "The Charm of Paul" in my "Pauline and Other Studies,' p. 31 f., where something like this is said; but what I then said has grown more definite through conversation with others, and especially with Principal Iverach.

XVI. St. Paul as the Beginning of the New Testament.

As has been said above, the New Testament begins with Paul and culminates with John. One is thankful to see that Dr. Moffatt has no sympathy with the old misjudgment regarding Paul's knowledge of Greek and his incapacity for expressing himself in Greek. It is one of the curiosities and absurdities of all literature that one of the greatest masters of Greek, the man who adapted Greek to the expression of a new ethic and a new religion—not in an artificial jargon of technical terms, but in the language of the world—should have been described by so many modern scholars as unable to write Greek and as uneducated in Greek. Paul was fully conscious of the task that lay before him, viz., to express to the Greek-speaking world the *Sophia* of God, the wisdom or

philosophy that is Divine, in other words the Christ who is the *Sophia* of God (1 Cor. I. 24, 30). He had not merely to destroy a false *Sophia* (and that very purpose of destroying it sprang from his knowledge of its insufficiency and hollowness), but to explain the true *Sophia*. He knew that he was the philosophic architect (*σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων*), who had to lay the foundation on which others should build (1 Cor. III. 10). Among the mature he expounded the Divine system of the true philosophy, the deep-lying scheme in which the Will of God has expressed itself, and he expounded it as a mystery, a secret truth now made plain to all (1 Cor. II. 6, 13). He took such words as "Salvation" and "Godliness" (*σωτηρία* and *εὐσέβεια*) [1] from the mouth of the pagans and put

[1] *εὐσέβεια* appears only in the Pastoral Epistles, and that has been unscientifically made a charge against their authenticity, as if "Godliness" were an un-Pauline idea. Considering how deep Paul had seen into the pagan heart and how well he understood the pagan nature, it would be to me an incomprehensible thing that he should never have explained to the men of his own age the true nature of that "Godliness" which was in their eyes so important.

in them a new spiritual meaning. All men around him in Tarsus and in Ephesus were making vows and prayers for Salvation; and we can now still read the record of their desires on hundreds of inscribed stones; but they had never dreamed of the spiritual kind of Salvation which Paul explained to them, nor felt their need of it. It was the mission of Jesus at once to put into the hearts of men the sense of need for this Salvation, and to satisfy their need. It was the mission of Paul to make them understand the message of Jesus; and it was his Hellenic education and his understanding of the Greek nature and his power over the Greek language that fitted him for his mission, and marked him out as the Apostle of the Graeco-Roman world.

On Paul's power of expression Dr. Moffatt has some good things. On page 57 he says

Paul had often explained its nature in speech. By chance it does not come up in any of his earlier letters; but that does not prove either that he was ignorant of the idea, or that he considered it unimportant. How many things are there in his Epistles which occur only in one letter or in one group of letters.

that "more than once in Paul it becomes an open question whether he is quoting from an early Christian hymn, or developing half unconsciously the antitheses of his glowing thought: a good case in point is furnished by 1 Corinthians xv. 42-43. Elsewhere, however, the genuine rhetoric of the speaker is felt through the written words; they show unpremeditated art of the highest quality, as, e.g., in passages like the hymn to love (1 Cor. xiii.), or the great apostrophe and exulting paean of Romans viii. 31 f."

In the last sentence only the word "rhetoric" jars on me, and makes me uncertain whether Dr. Moffatt has felt the quality of Paul, or is merely under the influence of modern writers:[1] I can hardly imagine that one who had ever experienced the spell of Paul could apply the word "rhetoric" to the examples which he mentions from First Corinthians and Romans. He

[1] He seems to have derived the term "rhetoric" from the late Professor Blass, see p. 89. Blass used the term to indicate training in the schools of rhetoric, i.e., higher literature; but Dr. Moffatt employs the term in a different and modern sense.

goes on to quote from Norden that "in such passages the diction of the Apostle rises to the height of Plato in the 'Phaedrus'"; and he refers to Wilamowitz, who with true insight calls Paul "a classic of Hellenism". I may complete this last reference by a fuller quotation. In his sketch of Greek literature Professor von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff assigns a high place to Paul: "That this Greek of his has no connexion with any school or any model, that it streams as best it may from the heart in an impetuous torrent, and yet is real Greek, not translated Aramaic (like the sayings of Jesus), makes him a classic of Hellenism. Now at last, at last one can again hear in Greek the utterance of an inner experience, fresh and living." That is what one feels in coming to Paul after the dreary centuries during which classical Greek seems dead,[1] though it was only re-creating and re-invigorating itself to conquer a wider world of thought.

[1] Taken from Mr. Bevan's stimulating article in the "Quarterly Review," July, 1910, p. 219. It is, however, very strange that he should speak of the great Greek scholar of Berlin as recently dead.

I may feel glad that the view of Paul's power as a Greek writer of the highest and most creative order, which I have for many years maintained without rousing general attention, is now being independently re-discovered in Germany and imported thence to Great Britain. There is a class of British scholars (to which I hope Dr. Moffatt does not belong) who set no value by any opinion in scholarship until it has appeared in a foreign language.

XVII. St. Paul and St. John.

The relation between St. Paul and St. John seems (in the present writer's judgment) to be of primary importance for the proper comprehension of the New Testament as a whole. What is adumbrated in Paul—"wherein are some things hard to be understood, which the ignorant and unsteadfast wrest unto their own destruction" . . . is wrought out finally in John's Gospel and his First Epistle to its absolute perfection as a religious expression suited for the ancient mind on the borderland between Greece and the East.

Yet to us in the West it is sometimes necessary to read Paul in order to understand John: often Paul comes nearer to our way of thought than John. Always, however, each must be read in the light of the other. There is a definite evolution of the religious consciousness beginning from St. Paul and culminating in

St. John; but it is an evolution towards fuller comprehension of the original teaching of Jesus. It is not the case that the "Church's consciousness" constructed for itself a new religious thought. From first to last both Paul and John were moving within the circle of Christ's thought: they were both interpreting according to their individual nature and experience the true content of His teaching. There seems no reason to regard John's Gospel as specially comprehensible to the Gentiles, though it was written in Asia for Asiatic Hellenes. It is deeply Palestinian in its cast of thought and expression; and the religious atmosphere in which it moves is non-Hellenic to a greater degree than the writings of Paul, which are more strongly tinged with Hellenism. Inasmuch as John wrote in Asia Minor, perhaps at Ephesus, a sort of prepossession has grown up that his work was most easily understood by Greeks. Do early quotations justify the belief that John's Gospel was most popular or most frequently read by the earlier Gentile Christians?

All that is in John is already implicit in Paul; but what lies in the letters of Paul becomes explicit and definite in the Fourth Gospel. John in his Gospel stands and moves always on the plane towards which Paul is struggling, and which he attains in his greatest moods and moments. If we ask how it was that John finally attained, while Paul was only striving towards it with the whole powers of his nature, like a runner pressing onward to the goal and staking his whole energy on gaining the prize, the explanation lies in the Revelation and the circumstances in which it was beheld—I say "beheld" rather than "composed". In that living death to which John was exposed, he was set free from the trammels of the merely human nature to such a degree as no man ever was before or since.[1]

[1] In my "Letters to the Seven Churches," chapter VIII., I have attempted to explain this view at some length.

XVIII. Incident and Teaching.

What one might call a certain lack of sympathy, and a consequent incapacity to comprehend the method and manner of the New Testament writers, is painfully apparent in page after page of this book. Without true sympathy the study of literature is valueless, and an Introduction is uninstructive. Examples can hardly be given, because this characteristic is too deeply interwoven in the whole fabric of the work. In truth this Introduction exists in virtue of a certain insensitiveness to the spirit and thought and tone of the New Testament, and could not have come into being in its present form, unless the Author had stood so absolutely apart from the period and the life amid which Christianity originated. Hence a simple example, or a score of examples, must fail to convey any impression of what I gather from the work

as a whole. How rare it is to find herein anything that quickens our comprehension, or raises our conception, of a book (or a series of books) to which the character of great literature pre-eminently belongs.

Still I shall refer to a matter which happens to stand on the page that I open at random, and which concerns a subject that has for a long time deeply interested me.

I take here one very slight example, more of manner and style than of thought, and yet one which to me is of considerable interest. On page 562, we find it stated "as a feature of a later age" that, in the Fourth Gospel, "the dialogues beginning with the introduction of some figure pass over into a disquisition or monologue in which the author voices, through Jesus, his own or rather the Church's consciousness, usually upon some aspect of the Christology which is the dominant theme of the whole book. The original figure is forgotten, . . . and presently the so-called conversation drifts over into a doctrinal meditation upon some aspect of Christ's person."

One marvels, first of all, at the phrase "so-called conversation". Where is it called a "conversation"? Certainly not by John, who thought of it in a very different way. Who calls it a conversation? Solely and simply Dr. Moffatt himself, who has never apprehended the manner, or imagined to himself the purpose and intention, that rule the Fourth Gospel. To him what he calls a "conversation" must be and remain a conversation.

In Chapter IV. of John's Gospel the disciples, when they came back to the well—I take just one of Dr. Moffatt's examples—found Jesus, "and they marvelled that He was talking with a woman: yet no man said 'What seekest Thou?' or 'Why speakest Thou with her?'" The verbs that are used, ζητεῖν and λαλεῖν, are perfectly suitable to the investigation of problems and to formal exposition. The woman herself went to the city and told the men, "Come and see a man which told me all things that ever I did: can this be the Christ?" There is here no word about a conversation. The woman recognized instantly that, following on the request by

a traveller for water at a well's mouth (the commonest incident of travel in the East), what might have continued as a conversation in the usual tone between a man and a woman alone at a well became at once a serious discussion about the greatest and gravest things in life; and she drew the inference, "Can this be the Christ?"

Dr. Moffatt, however, can see here only a "so-called conversation," and marvels that it was ever anything else. One can only marvel at his blindness.

We see, then, that John does not use the term "conversation" or anything corresponding to it: he was interested in these "so-called conversations" for the doctrinal meditation into which they pass. They begin as personal scenes, often marvellously individualized; and they gradually or instantaneously pass into a meditation. But why not? Why should the author be debarred from following out his own bent? He has produced the greatest book in all literature by doing so; but Dr. Moffatt cannot see the greatness and forbids the method.

In the second place, why is this method peculiar to and characteristic of the second century? Why was it impossible in the first century? Dr. Moffatt assumes that it is a "feature of a later age". He offers no evidence for the assumption; there is none to offer. He starts with the fixed idea that the book is late, and anything and everything in the book becomes to him forthwith a proof of lateness. He never asks why it should be late, or what marks it as of the second century. He simply assumes.

In the third place, Dr. Moffatt offers in a footnote one single analogy to the method which we find in John; and this analogy is taken from one of the few parts of the New Testament which he admits to have been composed in the first century and at the very beginning of Christian literature, viz. the Epistle to the Galatians II. 15 f. This analogy stands in a footnote, perhaps it is an afterthought; but how can a critic prove his assumption that this method of John's could only be originated in the second century, by a quotation from a first

century book? The natural insensitiveness of the Author to historical method, and his natural preference for wire-drawn argument, leads him into this absurd situation.

Dr. Moffatt goes on to say that "this method" in the Fourth Gospel "precludes the idea that the author could have been an eye-witness of these scenes, or that he is reproducing such debates from memory". Why so? What proof does Dr. Moffatt offer? None, except modern opinion and the passage from the Epistle to the Galatians. Now, that passage is autobiographical: Paul relates his own debate with Peter, and gradually "drifts over into a doctrinal disquisition," while "the original figure is forgotten," and we hear no more about Peter and have no "record of his final attitude or the effect which he produced".

It would not be easy to produce a more perfect parallel. Dr. Moffatt knows it, and quotes it, and argues that, inasmuch as this method was used by Paul in the first century, therefore it could not be used by John, but that its occurrence in a work bearing John's name

proves that the work was written in a later age. Is this historical reasoning, or literary criticism, or sheer prepossession with a fixed idea that anything and everything observed in the Fourth Gospel is, and must be, a proof of lateness and "pseudonymous origin"?

In the fourth place, with regard to this method, which Dr. Moffatt unhesitatingly takes as a proof of second century origin without any proof that it is usual in the second century—simply assuming that such a way of writing belongs to the second century, of which we know next to nothing—I would venture to maintain that the method is peculiarly characteristic of the first century. It belongs to the period when the facts were still close at hand, and not afar off: it belongs to the period when the lesson and the moral and the principle were still felt to be the most important—not that I believe the facts ever were regarded as in themselves unimportant, but they were more familiar and assumed as familiar. Finally, it is very characteristic of Paul, who slips so unconsciously from narrative of events to his own inferences from them, that

it is hard to tell where narrative ends and hortatory inference takes its place.

So it is in the passage quoted by Dr. Moffatt from Galatians II. 13 ff. So again it is in the passage 1 Corinthians XI. 25-34, where I defy any one to detect at what point the narrative passes from a direct simple recital of the words of Jesus, first into what may be a drawing out of the truth involved in the words, then into what must be such an exposition, and finally into a pure hortatory lesson deduced by Paul from what he begins as a narrative. There is in the passage no desire and no intention to paint a picture or describe a scene. There is only the intense and overmastering passion to bring out the bearing of the acts and words on the present situation.

To put the case in a word, the method of John in this respect is the method of Paul. If one belongs to the first century, there is no reason why the other also should not belong to the same century. John was not bent on writing a formal history. He records what in the end of his life remained to him most as a vivid

and deep-lying possession, viz., his memory of certain scenes and the lessons they conveyed to him (as he looked back over them) and to others (as he hoped).

The examples of this kind are numberless. Take Luke in Acts i. 16-22. Here you have a historical scene, the first filling up of a vacancy in the number of the Twelve Apostles. The situation is opened by a speech of Peter as president (so to say) at the meeting. For certain reasons, on which one need not here enter, the speech of Peter goes off into a brief historical narrative and returns to the main subject. The narrative is partly explanatory, addressed by the historian to the readers. How much is explanatory, and how far Peter is regarded as incorporating narrative in his speech, no one can say exactly and confidently. This was the method of the age, when people stood, almost or completely, in the immediate presence of the facts. It belongs to that age. I wait for some proof that it was more characteristic of the second century than of the first. It is, generally

speaking, characteristic of an attitude of mind; and it might therefore occur in any age, when the writer's mind was in a certain condition. It is perfectly harmonious with the tone of the first century.

XIX. The Fourth Gospel and its Author.

I venture to differ absolutely from Dr. Moffatt as to the nature and character of the Fourth Gospel.

It is not a history of the career of Jesus, in which narrative would be the most important feature. It states in the form which had gradually taken shape in the mind of John his way of understanding certain scenes—a very small number of scenes—in the life of Christ: these episodes in the Saviour's teaching were those that had decided and moulded his own conception of the nature of Christ and his own belief about Christ. He had pondered them, talked of them, and preached them, hoping to make others feel as he felt. The account of the teaching set forth by Jesus is affected by the quality of John's mind; that is admitted; but

the account is not discoloured thereby. It is the interpretation of Christ's words by a very great genius after a long series of wonderful experiences. The writer had lived in the company of Jesus. He had been one of the leading spirits in that critical period when the line of growth in the Church was determined. He had gone down into the valley of death, had lived there, rising above its terrors, and had come up alive. Such experiences had placed him at last on a higher plane than that on which ordinary men live.

In this Gospel we have the ripened results of his life and thought. It stands apart and alone, nearly related to the letters of Paul, yet in a class by itself. It is the most wonderful book that ever was written. The rest of the New Testament leads up to it, and it is the completion and the final expression of all that lies in the rest.

Dr. Moffatt seems to regard it as composed with some idea of keeping up the dignity of the Logos though he candidly acknowledges on page 527 that John "is too Christian to have

committed the error of depicting an entirely superhuman . . . Jesus". In passing we note the rather comic touch about John's being "too Christian": Dr. Moffatt almost seems to consider John as deliberately working up a picture of a false Jesus, but as "too Christian" to forget altogether that He was a man. Yet in the end of the paragraph he rightly quotes Dr. Inge, that John "is idealizing (showing the highest significance of) a historical figure".

One does not always know when one has pinned the Author down to a definite opinion. He quotes some other person, who says something essentially different and contradicts the real implication of his own statements. "The highest significance of a historical figure" is what John shows in the Gospel; but it is not what Dr. Moffatt describes him as showing.

We note here the Author's appreciation of things "well said by others," and his talent for quoting them in an interesting and striking fashion (see Section I). They do not always suit each other; but they are always good and often excellent.

A fact that is specially impressive, though unnoted by Dr. Moffatt, is that in the Fourth Gospel the Son is clearly subordinated to the Father, obeying the "Father's word," acting according to His commandment. According to Dr. Moffatt, John lays all the "emphasis on the self-determining authority of Jesus," and "from first to last He is master of His course" (p. 526). Jesus however lays all the emphasis on the commandment and word of the Father (VII. 17, X. 18, XII. 49, 50, XIV. 24, 31, etc.).

This relation of Jesus to the Father seems to me to be incompatible with "the self-determining authority of Jesus," of which Dr. Moffatt speaks, or with any intention of maintaining the dignity of the Logos.

Thus we have the antithesis: towards men Jesus speaks with absolute authority and Divine right; towards God He bears Himself as obedient and human. This absolute authority is an idea characteristic of John, who in the Revelation speaks to his Churches with the same absolute and complete authority, because he is speaking the words that have been entrusted to

him to transmit, yet with the same absolute obedience to the instructions and orders revealed to him.[1] It is this identity of the underlying and informing spirit that stamps the two books, in spite of serious differences in superficial qualities, as the work of one writer.

The question has already been put in Section XVI whether the Gospel of John is so Greek in feeling, or so suited for the Gentiles, as is commonly assumed. A strongly Semitic spirit seems to me to dominate the Gospel, though it is the spirit of a Semite who had passed through the varied experiences of John. The Gospel of Matthew seems to be most frequently quoted in the second century writers, not the Gospel of John.[2] As Principal Iverach points out, emphasis came to be laid on John's Gospel, not during the con-

[1] "Letters to the Seven Churches," p. 79 f.

[2] A rough indication of the tendency is seen in the quotations in the "Apostolic Fathers" (mostly Gentiles). Take the lists from the indices. In Lightfoot's edition we have forty-nine from Matthew and only twelve from John (admitting three by Ignatius); in the translation which forms part of the Ante-Nicene Library, eighty-four are assigned to Matthew, fifty-two to John: a good many of these are dubious, yet the proportion serves as a guide.

version of the Nations, but only after Christological questions began to be prominent. John's writing was ahead of his own time, and was not elicited by the spirit and the questions and the desires of those among whom he lived. As Jesus did, so John influenced his age. Jesus created new needs: He educated His world: He aroused in it (as education always does) new susceptibilities, new aspirations, a new sense of want and of sin. Neither the figure of Jesus in the Gospels, nor the Fourth Gospel, was created by the needs of the age. They created those needs by elevating and educating the minds of men.

Another idea, which seems in my judgment wholly external, false and uncomprehending, appears in such phrases as that on page 522, where Dr. Moffatt says that John "has worked in the Pauline antithesis of grace and law and Pauline ideas like God's sending of His Son and God's love".[1] The Author seems to imagine that the

[1] Grace and law, I. 17, compare Romans VI. 14; sending of His Son, III. 17, compare Gal. IV. 4 f.; God's love, III. 16, compare Eph. II. 4. I take the Author's quota-

Asian Jew (or Jews), who composed this Gospel and gave it the false appearance of being written by an eye-witness recording his own testimony, deliberately set to work to gather together ideas from various sources and to weld them together with extraordinary skill, just as our modern Author has set to work to go through exactly the same process with similar skill.

The critic who studies the Fourth Gospel from this point of view is already at the outset turning in the wrong direction. The farther he proceeds, the more distant is he from the truth. This Gospel has nothing "worked into" it. It is a growth, a vital organism, the expression of a life's experience. That John took from Paul such an idea as God's love or God's sending of His Son could only be laughable. On that supposition the only possible line of argument is that which Dr. Moffatt follows: the writer who had to learn such ideas from Paul, the writer who had not learned them from Jesus, could not

tions, but observe that here (where it is a question of borrowing Pauline ideas) Ephesians is accepted, though in the treatment of Paul's Epistles Ephesians is rejected.

possibly be John, but must be some later person or persons, masquerading under the character of a companion of Jesus.

In this way the conclusion which is finally reached is already involved in the initial supposition. The discussion on the Gospel resolves itself into an answer to the question, "Who can have written the Fourth Gospel, and how can he have come to write it, if we start with the assumption that John had no part, share or lot in it?" For the honest student of literature or of history, the value of such a discussion, conducted on such principles, is nought. We look for a fair attempt to answer the previous question, "Did, or did not, John write this Gospel?" and the second question is quietly substituted for the first, while the answer to the first is assumed.

As "Sources" of this Gospel Dr. Moffatt enumerates three besides the Old Testament, viz., Paulinism, Philonism, and Stoicism. I am sure the Author does not really think that out of these four "Sources" the Fourth Gospel can flow. Soon afterwards he admits another

"Source," the Synoptic tradition. There is just one "Source"; and that is the personal knowledge, the wide experience, the intellect, the character and the power of John the disciple; but Dr. Moffatt does not take this factor into the reckoning. He wipes out John in a word, p. 315, and then settles the problem of the Fourth Gospel.

XX. The "Semi-Pseudonymity" of First Peter.

We have hitherto left wholly out of count Dr. Moffatt's attitude to the First Epistle of Peter, an attitude which is so enigmatic and confusing as to defy definition or comprehension, and to evade all inferences.

Nominally he with much hesitation calls this Epistle the work of St. Peter: practically he assigns it in so great a degree to some one else, that we learn nothing from it about the Apostle's personality. Hence it becomes possible for the Author at once to make Peter the source from which emanated this great Epistle, and yet to maintain a few pages earlier in the same Chapter III., that the writer whose name the Epistle bears is as a man less known to us than Papias or Hegesippus. Hence, too, he can assert that, after Paul, "a mist lies over

the early Church, which is hardly dissipated by the recognition of Luke as the author of the Third Gospel[1] and Acts, or of a John in Asia Minor, with whom some of the 'Johannine' writings may be connected". Hence, finally, he can class the Epistle as first, and presumably as thoroughly characteristic, among "the pastorals and homilies . . . which are obviously sub-Pauline, which must have been composed during the last thirty years of the first century and the opening decades of the second, which can be approximately grouped and in some cases dated, but which elude any attempt to fix them down to a definite author".

What are we to make out of this tissue of contradictions? The obscurity only becomes

[1] I find that I have unconsciously altered Dr. Moffatt's usage in regard to capitals in many cases. He spells gospel, apostle, church, etc., always with small initial letters. One might have thought that the distinction between church, a mere building, and Church as the idea, was worth observing and that the Gospel of Luke was as deserving of a capital as the Acts of the Apostles. Having begun with this spelling, I may be permitted to continue it to the end.

more dense as we go more minutely into details. The "pastoral" called First Peter is classed among the works composed between A.D. 70 and say 120, first in the class; and yet on page 339 Dr. Moffatt cannot induce himself to abandon "the traditional *terminus ad quem* of Peter's life," viz. A.D. 67. Now the difference between a date some short time before 67 and some (short) time after 70 is not a mere question of a few years up or down in a uniform period: it means the choice between two markedly different periods.

To take another example of the obscurity and (one almost says) self-contradiction, we find on page 315 that "the traditions of the next century, such as they are, yield little or no data" to guide us regarding this class of Homilies and Pastorals, and "it is seldom certain whether such traditions are much more than imaginative deductions from the writings themselves". It is open to some critics to use this language about a class of documents in which First Peter is included; but Dr. Moffatt is barred out from it by his own admissions and opinions. "The Epistle," he says,

"was familiar to Polycarp."[1] Polycarp died at the age of 86 in 155 or 166 A.D.;[2] and his testimony to the Epistle of "Peter, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, to the elect, etc.," is the evidence of one whose knowledge reached back into the first century. Prof. Harnack is free to set aside this testimony as valueless, because he regards the introductory address as a spurious addition; but Dr. Moffatt disagrees with him, and after some slight hesitation pronounces the address original and genuine; and

[1] Dr. Moffatt uses the spelling Polykarp and has a strange preference for such anomalous and impossible forms as Illyrikum (p. 144) and Ikonium. It is allowable and right to prefer the Greek spelling Ikonion to the Latin form Iconium, but he must choose one of the two. Ikonium is a hybrid; Illyrikum is worse: the form Illyricum is Latin: Illyris is the proper Greek, used by Ptolemy, and Illyrikon is used only by Greek writers dominated by the Latin form, such as Paul and Dio Cassius. This is pointed out, I think, in my "Histor. Commentary on Galatians"; but I am writing far from books, and cannot verify. Illyrikum is an outcast, rejected by gods and men. Polykarpos is a correct form; but Polykarp, though less unjustifiable than Ikonium, is not pleasing. [See p. 277.]

[2] There is evidence against the date 166 to use, disregarded by or unknown to the recent champions of that date.

if that is so, then the testimony must rank as of the very highest character known in ancient literature. Dr. Moffatt must stand by his own opinions, and not hold them in one page only to reject them in another.

So also with the testimony of Papias, who "knew and used the Epistle" (p. 337). Why does Dr. Moffatt desert his favourite Papias here? Why not use as evidence for the character of Peter the Epistle which Papias knew and used? Is it because the matter is certain in this case, whereas in regard to John's death the evidence of Papias, to which he attaches such value, depends on the ingenious combination of two uncertain references in two absolutely worthless late writers, who stand convicted of other errors in the same sentences in which they mention Papias? It is a curious fact about some scholarly minds, which I have observed and commented on many years before the name of Dr. Moffatt was known to the world, that they sometimes tend to value evidence not in proportion to its real weight, but in proportion to the ingenuity required to obtain or manu-

facture it. Where we know Papias on the indisputable authority of Eusebius, Dr. Moffatt passes him lightly by. Where we know him only on the strength of uncertain interpretation and comparison of obscure words, used by George the Sinful and a late Epitomizer to support the common opinion, Dr. Moffatt regards him with the highest respect as vouching for the contrary opinion.

One might go on citing cases in the Section on First Peter where the supposition rejected on one page is used as an argument in another; but it is needless to continue such ploughing of the sand. The method of the Section is misleading; the reasoning is involved and not unified, and the only cause which I can see is that Dr. Moffatt does not like the conclusion to which he is driven, viz. that the "Petrine origin . . . probably will carry the day" (p. 344). This slight, so to say, subconscious dislike appears in such an expression as that on pages 333-4: "this or almost any form of the pseudonym-hypothesis is legitimate and indeed deserving of serious consideration in view of the

enigmatic data of the writing". This is a noteworthy sentence, revealing a bias of which Dr. Moffatt is probably quite unconscious.

For my own part I should unhesitatingly venture to regard the problem of First Peter as among the simplest in character, the least complicated by varying shades in the "data," the most distinct and certain as regards result, of all the questions regarding the books of the New Testament; and to an unusual degree "the evidence for the existence and authority of the Epistle in the Church," as Dr. Moffatt says, "is both ample and early". Here, if anywhere, the pseudonym-hypothesis is extravagant, unjustifiable, the issue of an unregulated judgment which fails to distinguish clearly between the probable, the improbable, and the impossible.

Hence Dr. Moffatt, so far as he reaches a conclusion, puts it as follows in the least indefinite and most personal expression of opinion that I can find, "This may stamp the Epistle, if one choose to say so, as semi-pseudonymous" (p. 333)—a quaint and yet characteristic statement,

which can be used by the Author to support almost any train of reasoning, but which we cannot use without finding ourselves—whatever line we take—in contradiction with something which the Author says on some page or other of his discussion about Peter.

He says that "the dominant note of the Epistle is hope, but it would be unsafe to argue from the tone of a practical Epistle . . . to the character of the writer . . . as if the virtue of hope was specially prominent in his personality". Yet in the next paragraph he goes on to say that "a writing like this reveals a man's personality in several aspects, and one of these aspects is a warm, hopeful spirit" (p. 321). How can it be right to see in the Epistle the revelation of a warm hopeful spirit, and yet to caution the reader against inferring that hope was prominent in the writer's personality? What are we to make of this?

Vain every mesh this Proteus to enthral.

I feel inclined to hazard the conjecture that Dr. Moffatt wrote the former paragraph under

the influence of a critic who was enforcing the sound principle that a letter-writer often laid stress on some topic, not because it was specially characteristic of his own nature, but because it was what his correspondents most needed and lacked; and that he wrote the second paragraph under the influence of another critic who practised the equally right method of using a letter as an indication of character. It requires judgment, good sense, and above all a firm grasp of the personality of the letter-writer, to know when to use one and when the other of two equally sound principles. You cannot attain to a healthy and guiding criticism without exercising common sense. Now in this case Dr. Moffatt on his own showing and declaration lacks one of the needed elements in sound consistent criticism: he has never got hold of the personality of Peter, who is to him little more than a name, or rather a "semi-pseudonym". Without that firm grasp it is vain to criticize literature, for the criticism must become like "autumn trees without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots, clouds without

water carried along by winds"—*unerquicklich wie der Nebelwind.*

I must not, however, pass from this subject without adding that there are many interesting and useful remarks about the character and spirit of the Epistle, and that here and elsewhere Dr. Moffatt often shows his remarkable power of introducing apt and pertinent quotations from many writers. He has read so much and so carefully that his best paragraphs approximate to a cento of striking things quoted from a vast variety of sources.

XXI. The Study of Opinions.

The great danger of this method of collection and comparison of various opinions of modern scholars is that it tends to produce among those who are not so learned as Dr. Moffatt the impression that this is right method of study, and that by classifying modern opinion one can arrive at a sort of resultant of right opinion. We have a Resultant Greek Testament, which gives a text based on that method, but in that line of study the method is not so misleading, though equally unscientific. The text of the Greek Testament has to be determined by a comparison and classification of written authorities; but a work like that of Dr. Moffatt is largely a sorting out of the rubbish heap of criticism, a classification of the residuum of useful remarks and suggestions after all the vast mass of useless statements has been rejected.

By this method, however, what is kept is not a residuum of true statements, but a residuum of statements possessing sufficient ingenuity or plausibility to conceal their essential falsity and unscientific character.

Moreover, the method of collecting and sorting modern opinions ignores a fundamental factor, essential to right judgment in this matter. Those remarks and suggestions are repeated here apart from their context, whereas they originally formed stages in a wider theory, which in most cases even Dr. Moffatt rejects, and they first came into existence as the application of that theory, which has now few or no believers. The treatises from which they are quoted were each of them the logical carrying out of an idea which, generally speaking, has since been weighed and found wanting; and they all partake of the falsity of the general idea out of which they arise.

The mass of erudition and of quotations from or references to modern scholars and their opinions is enormous, and bears ample witness to the work and care expended on this book by

the Author. On page 73, at which the book happens to open, I find fourteen quotations from or allusion to modern critics, and an "etcetera" following one list of five names. I have not verified any of the references to modern scholars, but accept them as correct.

XXII. Analogies from Classical Non-Christian Literature.

An interesting and really important feature of Dr. Moffatt's book is the large number of analogies quoted from the history of classical literature. As the only reference which has been made in the present review to this feature of the book gives a not very favourable example, I feel bound to say that the Author's examples are often good and useful, and that sometimes, in a spirit of perfect fairness, Dr. Moffatt quotes them even though they do not tell in favour of his own view. Their number shows how widely he has cast his net in preparation for the book that lies before us. We may profitably look for a little into this whole subject.

Some modern scholars have argued that certain difficulties and apparent or real inconsistencies in the New Testament books discredit their

trustworthiness and historical authority. If, however, we compare these books with the best classical literature, we shall be struck with the much more numerous difficulties in the latter than in the former. There is hardly an ancient writer of the highest class who is not full of unsolved problems in interpretation and text. The proportion of real "difficulties" is far greater in almost any classical author than in the New Testament partly because the text in the Testament is better, and partly because the writers are more careful.

Next as regards accuracy of record, it seems worth while to add an example taken from the literature of the last century before Christ, a strictly contemporary registration of events by an actor taking a prominent part in the action that he alludes to. I refer to Cicero, whose letters are the best authority for his time and an authority unsurpassed in any period, and who is a witness characterized by the highest education and the most perfect honesty. Do we find in him a total absence of the difficulties and the slight superficial inconsistencies which occur

in the New Testament, and from which such sweeping inferences have been drawn?

In the year 51 B.C. Cicero travelled across Asia Minor from Laodiceia to Iconium. We have many of his letters written during the journey, or during the next two or three months, describing his route. Yet the problem of fixing the exact rate and stages of his journey remains still unsolved after many attempts. The latest attempt known to me, and the most pretentious, that of O. E. Schmidt in his "Briefwechsel des M. Tullius Cicero" (Leipzig, 1893, p. 77 f.), is the worst and most extraordinarily inaccurate of all. Though he estimates the distances from city to city very much according to the freedom of his own will, yet he makes the rate of Cicero's travelling vary very widely;[1] the 126 miles from Philomelium to Iconium[2] he supposes to have been traversed in three days, an average of forty-two miles a day, by a man 55 years

[1] As regards Schmidt's estimates of distance he gives Kiepert's map as his authority; but he must have used a very early edition of Kiepert.

[2] This is Schmidt's estimate.

of age, used to a sedentary life in the city. No traveller, who knows by practical experience what travel in that country is like, will admit that Cicero travelled at such a rate with his train. Schmidt himself elsewhere states that thirty miles a day was Cicero's ordinary performance on this journey.

In spite, therefore, of the number and minuteness of the references and statistics and descriptions that Cicero gives of this short journey, his words have proved unintelligible to generations of scholars, and have given rise to quite extraordinary misapprehensions, to which I find no parallel in the New Testament. My own theory of the stages and distances varies greatly from Schmidt's: I think Cicero travelled at the rate of about twenty-five Roman miles per day, and I date his arrival in Iconium very differently. Yet we both found on the same ancient words used by one author about his own journey, and the words were all written while he was in Asia Minor, and some while he was on the road between Laodiceia and Iconium.

Moreover, Cicero contradicts himself repeatedly

in his statements about this journey. In one place he says that he stayed 2 days at Laodiceia, 5 days at Apameia, 3 days at Synnada, 5 days at Philomelium.[1] In another place the numbers are 2, 4, 3, 3.[2] In a third they are 3, 3, 3.[3] These cannot be reconciled with one another. Theories, on which we need not enter, may be devised to explain the differences in part; but even these must assume that Cicero wrote about such a simple matter from widely different points of view [4] at intervals of a few weeks.

Now, if such differences, or anything approaching them in extent, occurred even between different writers in the New Testament, what inferences would have been drawn according to the methods of reasoning fashionable among many modern scholars! This may be left to the reader's imagination.

[1] "Ep. ad Att." v. 20. [2] "Ep. ad Fam." xv. 4.

[3] "Ep. ad Att." v. 16: this was written before he reached Philomelium, and therefore the length of stay there is not given.

[4] The attempt to attain uniformity in the evidence by alteration of the text is absolutely barred by the evidence and conditions.

Nor is it only about the events of the immediate past that Cicero differs from himself. He varies also about his plans for the future. During a residence in Laodiceia some months later, he wrote to his friend Atticus twice, saying that about or after 15 May he intended to start for Cilicia; but to another friend he wrote: "I think of starting for Cilicia about the first of May". In yet two other places he says he is going to start on 7 May.[1] It has been argued that Paul, after he stated in Acts xx. 25 his intention of not returning to visit his Churches in the Ægean lands, could not possibly have altered his plans in subsequent years; and serious inferences have been drawn from this. The same writers who insist that Paul could not have altered his intentions in that case must also argue that nothing but death could have prevented him from executing his declared intention of visiting Spain (Romans xv. 23). When

[1] "Ep. ad Att." v. 21, vi. 1 (15 May); "Ep. ad Fam." xiii. 57 (about 1 May); "Att." vi. 2, "Fam." ii. 13 (7 May). No editor has wantonly altered the text in order to secure uniformity.

he mentions that intention he confirms Luke's report in Acts xx. 25 as to his feeling that the Ægean lands were now too narrow for his work. Cicero, however, could change his intention within a few days, and no Classical scholar dreams of any difficulty when he altered his plans as circumstances became different.

XXIII. The South Galatian Question.

For a good many years I have, so far as possible, avoided making any reference to the controversy about the "Churches of Galatia". In writing on "The Cities of St. Paul," it was of course inevitable that an account of the great Galatian cities must take up an attitude on this matter. In fact, the mere omission of all North Galatian cities in such a book presupposes the opinion that the Apostle did not visit that country. It was, however, my purpose to state only what appeared to be most important for the right understanding of the history and character of each city, Iconium, Antioch, Lystra and Derbe, and tacitly to omit contrary opinions except on two or three matters where wrong views had been advocated not long previously by distinguished scholars, as for example that Iconium was a Roman colony in the time of

St. Paul, and that it was detached from the Province Galatia and incorporated in the new Province of Cilicia-Isauria-Lycaonia by the Emperor Hadrian about the end of his reign, A.D. 130 to 137.[1]

I was perfectly content to wait the progress of discovery. There is abundant evidence in the country which will gradually be found by exploration. Had I been able to spend the needed money and time purely on a systematic exploration of the Pauline country, the amount of evidence bearing on this subject would have long ago been largely increased in amount. Its character would not have changed. The new evidence will not contradict, but confirm, the old; and the old evidence was sufficient to settle all the subsidiary questions relating to the Galatian churches for any one who is willing to study it sufficiently, and not merely to glance over it for the purpose of finding weapons to

[1] As it chanced, the most eminent champion of the former opinion held the South Galatian view, and the principal advocate of the latter was a distinguished numismatist.

destroy his opponent's position. The evidence, however, had only an indirect bearing on Pauline questions. It settled the main questions regarding the history of the South Galatian cities. It showed them as important cities of the Province, proud of their Roman character, some as colonies, some as Hellenic States of the Empire, of which they formed a part in virtue of their position in the Province. They were only indirectly and not directly Roman States: they were units in the fabric of the Province, and the Province was part of the Empire. But there existed no evidence bearing directly on Pauline questions; and no such evidence is to be expected. It is in the last degree improbable that any proof will ever be found in the soil of South Galatia that Paul traversed that country on his third missionary journey (Acts XVIII. 23). Still less can proof be expected that he did not go through North Galatia on that journey or on his second journey; and nothing less than such a negative proof is likely ever to convince the old North Galatian theorists. They can always find some new way

of evading the indirect evidence; and, though they are proved wrong in every objection they make to the South Galatian view so far as external history, antiquities and geography are concerned, yet ingenious manipulation of the Lucan and Pauline references easily provides a stronghold where they can feel themselves safe.

But though no direct proof of the route followed by St. Paul in his second and third journeys is to be expected, the indirect proof will be greatly increased both in amount and in clearness. It has been made an argument against me that several of my positions depended on one single piece of evidence. One single inscription is really as strong as a score on matters of administration and bounds and political arrangement; but the argument will be more convincing to the world, when a score of inscriptions attest the same fact. The Province Galatia was so little known that many details regarding it depended on one witness, and much was unattested and unknown, a matter of conjecture and analogy.

Moreover, the increase in the amount of

evidence will also make the attestation more clear and simple. When facts of organization in a Province like Galatia, of which very little is known, depend on a single witness, the testimony needs commentary and elucidation; and the complicacy of the explanation makes those who have not carefully studied the subject feel some doubt about the force of reasoning which has to be so elaborate. When there are twenty attestations, these elucidate one another, and produce a simpler, more complete and more convincing picture.

These reflections were roused in my mind by reading the few paragraphs in which Dr. Moffatt, page 95 ff., dismisses the Galatian question. A more extraordinary caricature of a historical theory it would be difficult to find than his statement of the arguments for the South Galatian theory. I do not mean that Dr. Moffatt intentionally caricatured the South Galatian arguments. His strong desire to be strictly fair and accurate in stating views from which he dissents is conspicuous throughout his book; but he has evidently only dipped lightly into the

subject, and has never studied the history of Anatolian society and the geography of the country sufficiently to understand the arguments on the opposite side, or to reproduce them accurately.[1] Moreover, he has the type of mind which feels so strongly on one side that it is hardly able to state without disparagement the opposite side.

The question will solve itself in the progress of discovery; and therefore I need not go further into wearisome detail, or discuss Dr. Moffatt's counter-arguments; but I will simply mention some fresh evidence, most of which was found in 1911, when we were able to spend several days continuously at Pisidian Antioch: see Sections XXIV-XXVII.

[1] See footnote, p. 73.

XXIV. The Phrygian Region of Galatia Provincia.

It is a cardinal point in the South Galatian view that there was a region of the Province called Phrygia, and that this region included the cities of Iconium, Antioch of Pisidia,[1] and Apollonia. One inscription[2] mentions Phrygia as forming part of the Province Galatia. Now the greater part of Phrygia was in the Province Asia. This Galatic Phrygia must therefore have been a smaller part outside the Asian frontier; and Ptolemy depends on authorities who recorded[3] that there was in the Province Galatia

[1] Originally called Antioch towards Pisidia (Strabo about A.D. 19): then Pisidian Antioch: then Antioch of Pisidia.

[2] C.I.L., iii. 6818.

[3] The evidence is a little complicated, and depends on the restoration of the geographical authorities employed by Ptolemy. In V. 4 he gives a list of cities in Pisidian Phrygia (the same region which Strabo calls "Phrygia towards Pisidia"). That region was part of Galatia Pro-

a region Phrygia containing the cities Apollonia, Antioch, and others. Strabo also describes both those cities as being in the country Phrygia; and numerous witnesses prove that they were included in the Province Galatia. Still there was naturally a craving for an inscription which stated simply and directly that Antioch was reckoned by the Romans to be part of a region called Phrygia.

The nearest approach to such proof lay in two inscriptions, which seemed to mention Phrygian Antioch; but both were expressed in poetic phraseology; and one of these was inter-

vincia from 25 B.C. to A.D. 72. Thereafter the largest part of Pisidian Phrygia was included in the new Province Lycia-Pamphylia, and Ptolemy intended to omit from the list the two Phrygian cities which were left to Galatia, but by error he retained Antioch in the list. He mentions also in V. 5 both Antioch and Apollonia in the Province Galatia as cities of the district Pisidia; but the small parts of Phrygia and Pisidia which were left to Galatia were in the Roman lists commonly called Pisidia (see "Histor. Geogr." p. 253), though the natives of Galatic Phrygia clung to the racial name Phrygia or Mygdonia as late as the third century. Much the larger part of Pisidia proper, also, was assigned to the new Province Lycia-Pamphylia from A.D. 74 onwards.

preted by Kaibel as alluding not to Antioch, but to Magnesia on the Maeander,[1] while in the other the name Antioch was restored. The former therefore is unconvincing.

The latter inscription is engraved on a large basis intended to bear a statue. Professor Sterrett copied it in 1884: it mentions on one side of the stone a "regionary centurion," who was honoured by the city of Antioch; and Professor Sterrett altered his own copy to "legionary centurion". My protest against this change was approved by Professor O. Hirschfeld of Berlin, who in discussing the police system of the Roman Empire regarded this "regionary centurion" as an officer charged with the maintenance of peace in the region of which Antioch was capital. This diversity of reading, however, encouraged others to doubt the force of the inscription, especially as the name of the region seemed not to be expressly stated. On the adjoining side of the stone Prof. Sterrett copied a

[1] "Cities of St. Paul," pp. 260, 445; "Histor. Comment. on Galatians," p. 201; Kaibel, "Inscr. Graec. Ital." etc., no. 933.

mutilated inscription relating to the same centurion, whose statue once stood on the basis. In slightly differing ways he and I partly restored this mutilated inscription; he read "the Mygdonian city of the Antiochians"; I proposed "Mygdonian Antioch," which made a hexameter line. Still the inscription was incomplete; and there can never be any finality about an incomplete restoration. There could be no doubt that "Mygdonian" was a mere poetic epithet equivalent to "Phrygian"; but it was not absolutely certain that the epithet was applied to Antioch;[1] and, if it were so applied, it might only indicate that the city had been originally Phrygian.

In 1911 we found the basis, half buried in a Turkish cemetery and turned upside down. I got a man to dig it up, but the difficult side was in deep shadow, and could not be read until the sun reached it. I could only see that the important word was neither *Ἀντιόχεια* as I proposed, nor *Ἀντιοχέων πόλις* as Sterrett restored,

[1] Of the word "Antioch" ANI was read on the stone by Professor Sterrett, but all the rest was conjectural.

but something quite different.[1] This was disquieting, and threatened to give a different and less illuminative turn to the inscription.

During the next two days we were wholly taken up with another more important discovery of which more will be said elsewhere. At last, on the morning of our departure from Antioch, we prepared to clear up the difficulty, while the morning light shone on the undeciphered side. Our travelling companions[2] went off to the stone, while Lady Ramsay and I waited to see the camp packed, and then followed them. We met them half-way on their return. They had the complete text, which was far better than I had ever imagined: *τόνδε σε Μυγδονίη Διονύσιον ἀντὶ βίου πολλῶν καὶ τῆς εἰρήνης στέμμα.*

Mygdonia, therefore, is used not as an adjective, but as a noun. The country Mygdonia at Antioch can of course be nothing but Phrygia expressed by a poetic synonym. Mygdon was

[1] I could see that *αντι* was the beginning of the last word or words, but the rest was not *όχεια*.

[2] Mr. W. M. Calder, Brasenose, Oxford, and Miss M. M. Hardie, Newnham College, Cambridge, both former pupils of my own in Aberdeen.

an ancient Phrygian king, and Mygdonia was either a district of Phrygia,[1] or Phrygia as a whole. Pliny indeed distinguishes Mygdonia from Phrygia, placing it on the southern frontier of Asian Phrygia (i.e., Phrygia in so far as it belonged to the Province Asia), adjoining Pisidia and Lycaonia. This is an excellent description of Galatic Phrygia, and agrees exactly with the evidence of the inscription now before us. Hence I cannot see any loophole for escaping the conclusion that a certain region of the Province Galatia, having Antioch as its metropolis and centre, was called Phrygia (C.I.L., iii. 6818) or Mygdonia.

The translation of the text as now constituted presents some difficulty. The general import is evident: on one side of the stone the metropolis Antioch honours Dionysius the regionary centurion: on the other side the whole *Regio* over which he was placed in authority does honour to him as protector of the life of many and as

[1] De Vit. *Onomasticon* (added to Forcellini *Lexicon*), *Mygdonia Regio Phrygiae memorata,* Plin. v. 41, 1, Solin. 40, 9, Capell. 6, § 686.

guardian of peace.[1] The opening word τόνδε implies that a statue was placed on the basis. The construction would then be perfectly simple, were it not for the concluding word στέμμα, which Professor Sterrett eliminated conjecturally by altering his own copy to read ἕνεκα. There is however as little doubt about the reading in this case as there is in regard to ῥεγεωνάριον.

The text is probably to be explained as an example of double accusative, similar to but even more glaringly ungrammatical than the series of cases explained in "Studies in the History of the Eastern Roman Provinces," p. 278.[2] The meaning would then be "Thy statue here, a Dionysius (in marble), Mygdonia (erected, and honoured thee with) a crown, in return for (guarding) the life of many and (preserving) the peace".

The inscription belongs to the middle of the

[1] The exact title at an earlier period would have been Eirenarch.

[2] Several of these cases had caused trouble to interpreters; but when the class of examples is recognized and placed in order side by side, all difficulty disappears.

third century after Christ or later. There was therefore alike in the first century and in the third a region (*χώρα*, *regio*) of the Province Galatia called by the names Phrygia and Mygdonia, practically synonymous. To any one that has experience of Greek geographical terminology, there can be no more precise, definite and clear way of defining this region than the words of Luke in Acts XVI. 6, *τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν*, "The region which is from one point of view (i.e. racially) Phrygian and from another point of view (i.e. administratively) Galatic".

Mr. W. M. Calder will, I hope, soon publish an argument, in which he attempts to mark out the bounds of Galatic Phrygia or Mygdonia according to the extension of the Phrygian language. A negative argument can also be derived from the use of other languages than Phrygian. Thus Lystra is proved to be beyond the bounds of Phrygia, not merely by the express statement of Acts XIV. 6, but also by the use of the Lycaonian language in the city; and wherever the use of the Pisidian tongue can

be demonstrated or made probable, the presumption is correspondingly strong that we are outside of Galatic Phrygia and in Galatic Pisidia. Antioch was, strictly speaking, a Phrygian city towards Pisidia, as Strabo defines it.

XXV. The Phrygian Language at Iconium.

By geographical conformation Iconium is, indubitably, a city of the great Lycaonian plain. It was assigned to Lycaonia by Cicero (who visited it several times) and by Strabo; it was the capital of a Province Lycaonia after A.D. 372. This might seem on a superficial view conclusive that Iconium was a Lycaonian city. Yet the evidence that it was a Phrygian city, and so called by its inhabitants, is overwhelming: see Hastings' "Dict. Bib." s.v., and other authorities.

When I first began to perceive that the people of Iconium persisted throughout the Roman period in reckoning their city as Phrygian, not Lycaonian, I knew that some strong racial feeling must have been confirmed by language: "in all probability difference of language originally emphasized their diversity from their Lycaonian neighbours".[1] In the same paragraph it was

[1] "Church in the Roman Empire," p. 38.

pointed out that in Asia Minor through all periods of history, down even to the present day, racial distinctions have been persistently and tenaciously maintained, and that prejudice and even antipathy have been felt by each tribe or race amid that motley population against its neighbours who differed in blood and language. At the present day even the unifying influence of Mohammedan religion and Turkish speech has not been strong enough to extirpate racial hatred between different peoples of Moslem faith living side by side in separate villages on the plateau.

In the "Cities of St. Paul," pages 329, 334, it was argued that this Iconian people became strongly affected by Hellenic civilization and language, so that the city became in outward appearance Hellenic; however, "it was not a body of Greek settlers, but rather the conquering and transforming power of Hellenic manners and education, that gave a Hellenized character to this Phrygian city, . . . but the Oriental [i.e. the Phrygian] spirit revived, and the native religion and the native goddess returned".

Again on page 366, with regard to the period A.D. 250-300, "Iconium was still a Greek-speaking city (except perhaps among the humbler classes, where the Phrygian language may still have lingered)".

This opinion that the use of the language kept the racial feeling strong was confirmed last year by the discovery of two Phrygian inscriptions in the hill which covers the remains of the Seljuk Sultans' palace in the centre of Iconium. We had the fortunate opportunity in 1910 of making some excavations in the hill and thus disclosing a considerable number of inscriptions, which were built into the basement of the palace. They belong to the period about A.D. 150 to 250; the only one which is dated bears the names of the consuls of A.D. 169, but many are certainly of the third century, and one of the two which are inscribed in the Phrygian language can hardly be earlier than A.D. 240 and may be even later.[1]

[1] They will soon be published by my companion in exploration, Mr. W. M. Calder, in the forthcoming number of the "Journal of Hellenic Studies," 1911, Part II.

There is therefore no doubt that the Phrygian speech was still in use among a section of the Iconian population during the third century, and *a fortiori* it must have been even more widely known in the middle of the first century. How then is this to be reconciled with two facts which are patent in the narrative of the Acts? (1) St. Paul addressed the Iconian audiences in Greek; (2) the people of Iconium who listened to Paul are called Hellenes.

These two questions are answered together. There was, as has been frequently pointed out and as has just been stated in the preceding pages, a very considerable amount of Hellenization in Iconium when St. Paul first saw it. It was already a Hellenic city in organization and management. The language of public business and municipal documents was evidently Greek, and not Phrygian. The education was Hellenic. The civilization of Greece had laid its grip on the people. The educated part of the community spoke Greek, although the uneducated certainly used the Phrygian tongue. To what extent individual Iconians spoke both

languages remains uncertain; but evidence bearing on this interesting question may yet be discovered.

As regards name, wherever Hellenic education had laid hold of a city of the Ægean lands or Western Asia, the Greek-speaking population counted themselves Hellenes, for Hellenism in that age was not a fact of blood, but of manners, ideals and language.

Hence Paul found in Iconium the Phrygian city, just as he found in Antioch the Roman *colonia*, a considerable Greek-speaking population; and it was among this section of the inhabitants that he chiefly gained his converts. Many of the Jews and the Hellenes believed; others of the Jews disbelieved and opposed him, and these enemies sought allies, not among the Hellenes, but among "the nations". Luke carefully draws this distinction; and it corresponds apparently in large degree to the distinction between the uneducated and therefore Phrygian-speaking part of the population and the educated and therefore Greek-speaking. The popularly elected magistrates sided with

the majority, as magistrates in a democratic city must always do.

It is not, of course, for a moment to be thought that all Hellenes in Iconium were with Paul, and the whole Phrygian populace against him; but clearly Luke's words convey the impression—and they must have been intended to convey the impression—that the Hellenes, as a rule, supplied the converts, and the non-Hellenes the opponents of Paul and Barnabas. Here and everywhere Luke's words, when closely scrutinized, point to the conclusion that the educated middle class, not the aristocracy on the one hand,[1] nor the superstitious lower classes on the other, formed the bulk of the Pauline Churches.

In the end of Hadrian's reign, about A.D. 130-137, Iconium became a Roman *colonia;* but there is no reason to think that this title im-

[1] In a Greek city there was hardly anything that could be called an aristocracy distinguishable by any generic name or characteristic; there was only an educated and an uneducated section of the people. In the Roman *colonia* there was an aristocracy, viz., the Roman citizens, and Luke states clearly that in Antioch they were opposed to Paul, Acts XIII. 50.

plied an access of Roman or Italian settlers (as it did at Antioch, when Augustus made that city a *colonia*). It meant only an advance in dignity and rights.

While the Iconians clung to their Phrygian character as opposed to the Lycaonian, there is no proof and no likelihood that the citizens styled themselves "Phryges". They would, probably, have called themselves "Hellenes," as Luke implies. The name "Phrygian" was almost equivalent to "slave". Phryx occurs often as a slave-name.

The association of Hermes with Zeus in Anatolian popular religion is proved specially for the district of Phrygia adjoining Iconium towards Tyriaion,[1] and for the district of Lycaonia adjoining Lystra (or perhaps belonging to Lystra), as Mr. Calder has shown in the "Expositor," 1910, July, page 1 ff.

[1] "Church in the Roman Empire," p. 58 *note*.

XXVI. Antioch a Galatian City.

In "Studia Biblica," iv. p. 53, I argued from an inscription of Apollonia that it was not merely a Galatian city, but was classed in the tribe of the Trocmi. In the inscription there quoted a person who gains distinction in Apollonia is said to gain distinction "among the sacred Trocmi" (*ἐνὶ Τρόκμοις ζαθέοισι*). It afterwards occurred to me that in this passage the Trocmi were perhaps meant figuratively to represent the Galatians as a whole,[1] so that the words implied no more than "among the sacred Galatians". If that were so, the inscription would merely say in emphatic terms that Apollonia was a Galatian city, and its people were Galatians and

[1] Metrical considerations made it impossible to write *ἐνὶ Γαλάταις* or *ἐν Γαλάταις*. Moreover, the name Galatians occurs in the preceding line (where the writer speaks of his fatherland, *πατρίς*, i.e. the city to which he belonged, as being "in the land of the Galatians," i.e. part of the Province Galatia); and some variation was desirable.

called themselves Galatians. Even this was a striking fact, for Apollonia was far more remote from North Galatia than Iconium or even Antioch; and, if its inhabitants could be spoken of simply as Galatians, then all the more could the inhabitants of those other cities be addressed as Galatians.

The city of Apollonia prided itself on its origin as a colony of Lycians and Thracians settled in this remote corner of Phrygia; and they boasted of this racial character in municipal inscriptions and on coins. They were not, and had no reason to be, ashamed of their blood and race, as Phrygians might well be—since "Phrygian" meant "slave". Yet even Apollonian citizens in certain relations spoke of themselves as Galatae, i.e., people of the Province Galatia.[1]

A fact which has recently been discovered by Mr. Calder suggests that my first interpretation may be correct, and that this region was ranked actually as part of the Trocmian territory. He has found, and will in due course publish, an inscription of Pisidian Antioch, in which Tavia,

[1] I need not quote again the oft-quoted passages where "Galatae" and "Galatia" mean the Province Galatia.

capital of the Trocmi, pays a compliment to its sister the *colonia* of Antioch. The term "sister" implies the thought of some peculiarly close connexion between Tavia and Antioch: they regard themselves as of the same family, sprung, so to say, from the same parents. The North Galatian tribe, proud as the Gaulish tribes always were of their origin, treats Antioch as a sister. It is difficult to imagine any stronger proof that this city of South Galatia ranked in the fullest sense as a city of Galatia, and that the tribal character was extended to include the South Galatian cities.

Lystra also addressed Antioch as a sister.[1] Both were Roman *coloniae*, founded by Augustus and peopled by his veterans; they were therefore of the same family, sprung from the same stock and parentage, Roman citizens and soldiers. This analogy shows how much emphasis must be laid on the salutation of Tavia addressed to its sister Antioch.

[1] See the inscription translated in "The Church in the Roman Empire," p. 50. It was discovered by Prof. Sterrett, and published in his "Wolfe Expedition," p. 218, and re-copied by me in 1886.

XXVII. The Importance of Pisidian Antioch.

Antioch was a city of great importance in the history of Central Asia Minor and in the development of Anatolian Christianity. It was long the guiding centre of Roman policy over a wide range of lands; and thus it became a home for the kings of neighbouring countries, as these were incorporated in the Province Galatia. In the beginning of the first century the son of King Tarcondimotus Philopator of Cilicia was buried there.[1] Soon afterwards Queen Tryphaena, well known as the protector of Thekla, settled in Antioch, when her son deprived her of her power in Pontus. Roman policy maintained these royal families, as British policy has treated the families of Indian princes.

In the third century Antioch was still a centre of Imperial opposition to the new faith.

[1] This we learned in 1911 from an inscription.

One of the most interesting and most obscure parts of history is the last struggle between Christianity and the moribund paganism of the Roman Empire between 250 and 315. The ancient authorities are not merely scanty, but also one-sided and strongly prejudiced; and the current of opinion in modern times ran rather strongly against them, until the recent discovery of evidence confirmed the main facts that they record. I remember well the change that was produced about the trustworthiness of Eusebius, the chief authority on the subject, in the mind of a great historian, when an inscription was found in Lycia giving the exact contemporary registration of facts about which in conversation he had professed doubts so strong as to amount almost to a condemnation of the Church historian as untrustworthy.

The story of the burning of an entire city in Phrygia during Diocletian's persecution because its whole population from the highest to the lowest were Christians, though once derided as a pure invention or at least a gross exaggeration, would now be doubted by few who study that

period of history; and I have given reasons for thinking that we can guess the name of the city which was destroyed.[1] In a recent book I collected a few of the other newly-found documents bearing on this subject,[2] especially those which showed the nature both of the popular movement and the governmentally engineered revival of paganism, and the tendency to clothe it in Christian forms. I mentioned there briefly the view which is stated and supported at considerable length in an earlier book,[3] that about A.D. 250 to 315 there existed on the estates which had once belonged to the god of Pisidian Antioch and which had been the property of the Roman Emperors from 25 B.C. onwards, an association or brotherhood called Tekmoreian, bound together in the worship of the Emperor and the old native religion for the purpose, among other things (such as occasional hieratic common meals), of resisting the new religion.

[1] "Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia," ii. p. 505 ff.

[2] "Pauline and Other Studies," No. IV.

[3] "Studies in the Eastern Roman Provinces," see the last paper on "An Anti-Christian Society in the Empire".

Such associations were extremely common in pagan life, and were a special feature of Anatolian society in all periods.[1] There are some special features about this Antiochian society, the Tekmoreian Guest-friends: one is that it was of so wide-stretching character, as if it aimed at being universal, the other that its members recognized one another by a Tekmor or secret sign.

The most striking detail on which my argument rested was a strange participle of an otherwise unknown Greek verb, viz. τεκμορεύσας. I argued that this word τεκμορεύειν must have been an invention of the period and place where it was found, because it was non-Greek in character, and that in view of the circumstances then reigning on imperial estates in Galatic Phrygia this newly-coined word must have been connected with the anti-Christian revival, and denoted an enforced compliance with the ceremonies of the association. The term and the custom connected with it were, in that case,

[1] "Studies in the Eastern Provinces," p. 318; "Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia," i. p. 97, ii. pp. 359, 630.

comparable to the certificates of compliance with pagan religious regulations which were given to recanting Christians in Egypt, as the discovery of some certificates has now conclusively proved.

The weak point of this theory lay in the isolated character of the word τεκμορεύσας. It occurred only once in an inscription in letters so faint that other copyists had not deciphered the word. There was room for justifiable suspicion that an error had been made by the copyist or by the engraver: the latter made several other mistakes in the same inscription.

Another criticism to which the theory that I proposed was open, and which was stated in letters and conversation by friends, was that the verb τεκμορεύειν, admitting its real existence, ought to mean "serve as an official in the Tekmoreian association".

To those criticisms no answer was possible. They had a certain strength and foundation. There was nothing to do but wait for the discovery of further evidence. The soil of Asia Minor is inexhaustible for the archæologist:

the evidence is there to clear up every difficulty and answer every question: all that is wanted is patient work with time and money, and properly trained and experienced scholars.

In 1911 we had the opportunity of spending eight days in or near Antioch, with many advantages for exploration; and we obtained results quite beyond my hopes. So far as concerns the religion of Antioch the report of our discoveries will soon be published by Miss M. M. Hardie, and the inscriptions of the city by Mr. Calder.

Many doubts have now been dissipated by the discoveries of 1911. The participle τεκμορεύσας is attested by more than a dozen votive inscriptions. We were so fortunate as to find the ancient holy place of Men, the god of Antioch, a great altar on the top of a mountain, open to the sky (as suits the situation), and surrounded by a wall enclosing the "holy place". The inscriptions belong to the late Roman period, towards A.D. 300; and it must now be taken as a fact from which discussion must start that this verb, hitherto unknown in Greek, came

into common use in and near Pisidian Antioch at the time of the pagan revival.

It must also be remembered that in Antioch the anti-Christian movement was specially strong, under the governor Valerius Diogenes, as we gather from the epitaph of Bishop Eugenius of Laodiceia (recently discussed at some length by Mr. Calder and myself, and by several German and French writers).[1] The date of Valerius Diogenes's rule is now fixed by several authorities: his tenure of office lasted after the victory of Constantine (as is proved by a dedication to that emperor which we copied at Antioch this year, and which could not be erected until peace was concluded between Licinius and Constantine in 314, perhaps not until 324). His government had begun before the banishment of the Empress Valeria in 311.[2] He was the agent of Maximin's persecution.

The wall of the precinct was covered, on at least one side, with votive inscriptions, of which we excavated and copied about seventy: among

[1] "Expositor," 1909 and 1910, Monsignor Batiffol in Paris, Professor A. Wilhelm, Cavalieri, and others.

[2] "Luke the Physician and Other Studies," pp. 344-5.

these about thirteen contain the participle in question. The following examples may be quoted here, as throwing light on the meaning of the term.

(1) L., son of Antonius, and Antonius brother and Maxima sister with children and foster-children (i.e., foundlings ?) [1] having all gone through the ceremony (or performed the act) of *tekmoreuein* (paid) to Men Askaênos [2] a vow.

(2) Fl(avius) Ci(ncius ?) Hilaris ? having performed the ceremony of *tekmoreuein* with wife and child (paid) to Men Askaênos a vow.[3]

[1] On *θρεπτοὶ* (*θρεπτά*, *θρέμματα*) and foundlings in the early Church, see the long discussion in "Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia," ii. p. 545 f., and authors there quoted.

[2] Λ.'Αντωνίου καὶ 'Αντώνιος ἀδελφὸς καὶ Μάξιμα ἀδελφὴ μετὰ τέκνων καὶ θρεπτῶν τεκμορεύσαντες Μηνὶ εὐχήν. It is not easy to explain why the oldest brother should be indicated only by an initial. It is perhaps an ignorant way of expressing in Greek the Latin form L. Antonius L. F. The other brother Antonius must in that case have had a different praenomen. This inscription, which is on a marble tablet, let into a niche cut in the wall of the holy precinct, is not earlier than A.D. 300, to judge from the lettering.

[3] Φ. Κι. Εἰλιρας (engraver's error) τεκμο[ρ]εύσας μετὰ γυναικὸς καὶ τέκνου Μηνὶ 'Ασκαηνῷ εὐχήν. Many of the inscriptions are hard to read.

(3) Gaius Vettius Umbricianus Maximus with Gaius his cousin having performed the ceremony of *tekmoreuein* (paid) to Men Askaênos a vow.[1]

(4) [Hy]acinthos, son of [Mn]esithe[os], having both performed the ceremony of *tekmoreuein*, [to Men Askaênos a vow].[2]

(5) Quintius to Men a vow, living in error, performing the ceremony of *tekmoreuein* with wife and children.[3]

Three or four of these inscriptions show that the word *tekmoreuein* does not refer to the holding of any office, whether in a society or in the city. Here groups of persons, and even a large family of brothers, sisters, children, and freedmen or foster-children, perform the act called *tekmoreuein* together.

Moreover, the name of the president of the Tekmoreian Association is now known; he was

[1] Γ. Οὐέττιος Οὐμβρικιανὸς Μάξιμος μετὰ Γαίου ἀνεψιοῦ τεκμορεύσαντες Μηνὶ Ἀσκαηνῷ εὐχήν. This inscription can hardly be later than the persecution of Decius, A.D. 250.

[2] Ὑάκινθος Μνησιθέου τεκμορεύσας [Μηνὶ εὐχήν]: names imperfect, as indicated above.

[3] Κύντις Μηνὶ εὐχήν, ἁμαρτάνων, τεκμορεύσας μετὰ γυναικὸς καὶ τέκνων.

styled *protanaklites* (as we have discovered from several inscriptions),[1] i.e. "he who reclines first at the table". The principal ceremony of the Associations was a sacred meal of religious character; and, if we may judge from the large subscriptions raised to defray expenses, the meal was celebrated frequently, and not merely once a year. In attempting to restore, detail by detail, the features of that remarkable pagan revival, I have often had occasion to point out that in many points it modelled itself on the acts and used the words of the Christians whom it was trying to crush.[2] This whole subject needs further elucidation, and is of the deepest historical interest. The title "who reclines first at the table" might easily, though not necessarily, be understood as an imitation of the Eucharist or the Agape; but, of course, the religious feast was a characteristic feature of pagan societies in all ages. On the sign in

[1] It should be read in one inscription, "Studies in the Eastern Provinces," p. 339, No. 17, l. 5, where I conjectured Protas son of Anaklitos. Read ἐπὶ] πρωτανακλίτου Ἑρμ[οδώρου ?]. One expects παρα-, or κατα-, not ἀνα-κλίτης.

[2] "Pauline and Other Studies," No. IV.

the Christian Church, used by travellers visiting strange congregations, see "Pauline and Other Studies," page 402.

The last dedication brings the act within the range of confessional and expiatory inscriptions, which were a remarkable feature of Anatolian religion. The popular name of these inscriptions was *exemplaria*:[1] "the authors are presented to the readers as having approached the hieron or engaged in the service of the deity" (or neglected the proper service), "while polluted with some physical or moral impurity . . . they confess and acknowledge their fault: they appease the god by sacrifice and expiation".[2] In the dedication now before us the act of *tekmoreusis* (to coin another word) is stated to arise not from a single act of sin—for in that

[1] The word *exemplarion* in Greek in the letters of Ignatius used to be quoted as a proof that the letters were a later forgery; but some *exemplaria* show the word in familiar use among very uneducated people in south-western Phrygia during the second century. The word does not occur in the known Antiochian inscriptions of the third and fourth centuries.

[2] Quoted from "Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia," i. p. 134 f. Examples of the inscriptions, *ibid.* p. 149 ff.

case the aorist would have been used—but from a course or life of sin—as indicated by the present participle.

In the fourth inscription the name Mnesitheos probably belongs to a Christian. In another [Ire]naeus, a favourite Christian name, probably occurs.

The documents now discovered do not prove the truth of my theory that *tekmoreuein* indicated recantation of Christianity under persecution; but they raise it from the rank of an hypothesis, based on a single occurrence in a badly engraved inscription of a verb otherwise unknown, to be the possible or probable explanation of a verb commonly used at a centre of anti-Christian feeling in the time when that feeling was strongest; and they set aside as impossible certain other explanations which had been suggested. The third inscription is the least favourable to my view, as it might possibly belong to an earlier period than the pagan revival; but on the other hand, it is quite suitable to the persecution of Decius, when the pagan revival had certainly begun. The other inscriptions are all indubit-

ably of the Decian or post-Decian period, and some are certainly as late as A.D. 300-315.

A subject so interesting as this deserves further investigation; the little sanctuary and its adjuncts ought to be wholly cleared.

The continuous importance of Antioch in Imperial and Christian history has escaped notice, because the city produced no great writer, no prominent historical figure, and no Christian leader; but it is a fact that has its bearing on the Galatian question.

XXVIII. A Greek Linguistic Argument.

On page 501 occurs a very bad argument. Dr. Moffatt essays to prove from the use of certain Greek words that the Revelation was written by a different author from the Fourth Gospel: among others in the Revelation "ἔρχου replaces ἐλθέ". Now, even if this were true, what strength would it have as an argument? Such a trifling variation in language is absolutely valueless.

It is a usage in both the Revelation and the Fourth Gospel to quote in brief the imperative word "come" from some supposed or real speaker (e.g., Rev. xxii. 17). If in each of two modern novels one found this usage half-a-dozen times, but in one the word was "approach," in the other "come near," the person who argued that this difference proved diversity of authorship would be pronounced incapable of reason-

ing about such a subject. It is quite possible that the same writer might use one word at one time and the other at a different period of his life.

As regards authorship, the important fact is that a similar brief way of quoting occurs in both books. But what if one book used both "approach" and "come near," the other only "approach"? Now that is the case here. In the Gospel John uses both ἔρχου and ἐλθέ,[1] the former more frequently: in the Revelation he uses ἔρχου only. Moreover, the one occurrence of ἐλθέ is not an example of this special form, but in the middle of a longer sentence after a preceding aorist imperative (IV. 17) φώνησον . . . καὶ ἐλθέ. The true state of things then is that both the Revelation and the Fourth Gospel express the idea "come" by the present imperative ἔρχου, but once the writer of the Fourth Gospel uses the aorist imperative ἐλθέ under the

[1] ἔρχου, I. 47, XI. 34; ἔρχεσθε, the plural, I. 40. In both Gospel and Revelation other parts of present ἔρχομαι and aorist ἦλθον occur all through. Why pick out imperative as alone typical?

influence of a preceding co-ordinated aorist imperative.

Another argument to the same effect is drawn on the same page from the fact that the Revelation uses *αἰώνιος* only once in XIV. 6, "and never connects it with *ζωή*," as is done several times in the Fourth Gospel. But how does that prove that different authors wrote those two books? Both books use *αἰώνιος*, one more frequently than the other. Such observations are mere pedantic trifling, if they are treated as evidence of authorship. Their value is different.

The whole theory regarding the Johannine writings is much on the same level as this, a wire-drawn, artificial and utterly unconvincing series of fanciful suppositions. It comes at the end and is a fair specimen of a work full of learning about modern views, and therefore likely to be very useful to those who desire to study the process of opinion about the New Testament; but the learning is rarely informed by an independent spirit or irradiated by a gleam of insight or sympathy. It is all hard, cold and external. Dr. Moffatt must change his method

radically, before he can succeed in doing what he was born to do. He ought to give up reading modern authorities for ten years, and devote that time to thinking and to studying the original authorities. His mind has been obsessed by persistently reading bad historical critics, until he has ceased to be able to distinguish good from bad criticism. He quotes plenty of good books, but he usually prefers the bad to the good. He balances the one against the other, and then misjudges, because he writes and thinks on his subject in an antiquated tone and spirit.

In view of his second edition, I add a few slips which need correction.

Though not observant in such matters, I have noticed a good many false accents or mistaken forms in the Greek words: on page 501 *ἀλήθης* in place of *ἀληθής*, *ἀφίεναι* for *ἀφιέναι*, *χάρα* for *χαρά*, on page 500 *ἰδιώμασίν* for *ἰδιώμασιν*, on page 269 *ἐμνηστευομένῃ* for *ἐμνηστευμένῃ* and *συ* for *σύ*.,[1] on page 28 *εὐσεβεία* for *εὐσέβεια*, on page

[1] The very fact that *σύ* or *ἐγώ* requires to be expressed proves that emphasis belongs to them; hence they are necessarily accented, though the oblique cases are enclitic when unemphatic.

33 *αἰωνί* should be *αἰῶνι*, on page 34 *ἡγιάσμενον* should be *ἡγιασμένον*, on page 45 *ἀκρόασεις* should be *ἀκροάσεις*, on page 67 *εὐαγγελισάμενου* should be *εὐαγγελισαμένου*, on page 163 *συνέργος* should be *συνεργός*, on pages 408 and 164 *εὑρόμενα* in the middle voice should be passive, either *εὑρημένα*[1] or *εὑρισκόμενα*, and on page 164 *προσσφέιλειν* should be *προσοφείλειν*, on page 173 and on page 590 *δικαιόσυνη* should be *δικαιοσύνη*, on pages 186, 194, *λόγιων* should be *λογίων*, on page 216 *πιστέως* should be *πίστεως*, on page 482 *ἀγαπήτος* should be *ἀγαπητός*, on page 330 *μέλεσίν* should be *μέλεσιν*, on page 300 *πρόκοπτω* should be *προκόπτω*, on page 297 *διαλογίσμος* should be *διαλογισμός*, on page 590 *ἐκ τινος* should be *ἔκ τινος*, *πάλαιος* should be *παλαιός*, and *οὐράνος* should be *οὐρανός*, on page 565 *ἐφωνήσα* should be *ἐφώνησα*, on page 588 *ψύχικοι* should be *ψυχικοί*, on page 585 *ἀντιχρίστοι* should be *ἀντίχριστοι*.

[1] *εὑρημένον* is correctly given on another page, if I rightly remember. The term is unusual; was Dr. Moffatt thinking of the common expression *ἅπαξ εἰρημένον*? Still *ἅπαξ εὑρισκόμενον*, though unusual, is a correct Greek expression.

On page 163 I fail to understand the statement about James that "Luke fails to record his death". The Author quotes Acts XII. 2; does he assume that this verse is an editorial addition and therefore more correct than Luke's own work?[1] I can hardly believe that he founds his reasoning on such a bare-faced assumption, and suppose that some other meaning, which I cannot fathom, lies in the words.

[1] I add some further corrections which have occurred or been suggested to me in later reading:—

P. 59. I know no homilies of "Ambrosiaster". P. 41, note †. Is Gudemann correct? I know an American scholar Gudeman, but have not seen the book here quoted. P. 47. Read *Δημοσθένους*. P. 61. Gal. I. 21 f.—wrong reference. P. 70, l. 8. Read *αὐτοῖς*. P. 71. Read *ἀπάντησις*. P. 93. Read Pamphylia. P. 55, note. Read Clark. P. 110. Read *ἰδού* and *ἑτοίμως*. P. 140. "Codex Amiatinus" is surely of century viii. not vi. P. 163. *Fugitivarii* wrongly used; read *fugitivi*. P. 164. Read *Wortschatz*. P. 173. Read *οἰκοδομεῖσθαι*. P. 190. Read *σύνταξις*. P. 210. Read *σωτῆρος*. P. 221. Read *ἀρχή*. P. 261. Is there good authority for the title "Expositio Evangelica" applied to the work of Ambrose? P. 307. Read *πνικτά*. P. 335, § 6. Read *ὅ γέ τοι*. P. 382. Read *auctor*. P. 392. Read Rutherfurd and *Ἐφέσῳ*. P. 536. Read *παρουσία*. P. 572. Read *ἐάν*.

XXIX. Conclusion.

Dr. Moffatt's book, full of learning and ability as it is, seems to exemplify what I once described as "a deep-seated vice in the modern methods of (New Testament) scholarship. The student finds so much to learn that he rarely has time even to begin to know. It is inexorably required of him that he shall be familiar with the opinions of many teachers dead and living, and it is not sufficiently impressed on him that mere ability to set forth in fluent and polished language the thoughts of others is not real knowledge. He does not learn that knowledge must be thought out afresh by him from first principles, and tested in actual experience, before it becomes really his own. He must live his opinions before they become knowledge, and he is fortunate if he is not compelled prematurely to express them too frequently and too publicly,

so that they become hardened and fixed before he has had the opportunity of trying them and moulding them in real life." These sentences [1] sum up what this review attempts to say at greater length. Underneath the book which lies before us there is hidden a greater man than the Author shows himself in the printed page. He is, as I believe, capable of far better work if he once learns that we are no longer in the nineteenth century with its negations, but in the twentieth century with its growing power of insight and the power of belief that springs therefrom.

[1] Taken from "The Charm of Paul" in "Pauline and Other Studies".

ABERDEEN: THE UNIVERSITY PRESS