

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

ON DR. SCHÜRER'S REPLY.

DR. SCHURER seems to me not to apprehend correctly the relation between us. He is the most prominent and the most learned champion of a view: I have attempted in a small and humble way to support a diametrically opposite view. It is therefore absolutely necessary for me, not merely to advance positive arguments for my view, but also to suggest reasons for refusing to accept his. My reasons must necessarily take the form of showing why I think his reasoning incorrect; and it is hard to do that in a way which shall be entirely pleasant and complimentary to the learned and distinguished Professor. For my part, I find it so difficult to state in simple and accurate words my own opinions and arguments, that, while writing, I can think of nothing except that prime duty; and I am sometimes apt, all unconsciously and unintentionally, to refer in a way which is perhaps rather brusque and brief to scholars like himself, for whom I entertain in reality profound admiration and respect. But, as a matter of fact, I have rarely mentioned him without some expression of compliment or eulogy, as any one may convince himself who will take the trouble to go over my references to him. Ever since he allowed himself in the columns of the *Theologische Litteraturzeitung*¹ to go to the verge of calling me a "humbug" (though he forebore to spell the word),² I have taken special care to be scrupulous in making compliments to him, and in expressing my obligation to him for the

¹ See the number for Aug. 5, 1893.

² Mr. W. T. Arnold, in the *English Historical Review*, 1895, p. 549, steps in to make Dr. Schürer's meaning quite clear, and mentions that he "only just abstained from using the word *humbug*." Dr. Schürer found it necessary to acknowledge that, after all, I was right in the one point at issue between us, which he did in a thoroughly scholarly way (*Theol. Litteraturzeitung*, September 30, 1893).

instruction and interest which perusal of his works has afforded me.

In his *Reply* in the EXPOSITOR, pp. 469 ff., I find no argument that I have not already met fairly and squarely; but a few notes may be added to bring out that, while he fastens on isolated details, detached from their context, he ignores the general drift of my remarks.

(1) On p. 471 Dr. Schürer accuses me of misstating his view, and of representing him to have asserted that a fact was impossible, when he only stated that it was not probable. Dr. Schürer has misunderstood my argument. My whole drift (see p. 198) is to bring home to him that, relying on a theory which he himself considers merely probable and does not assert to be definitely proved, he casts doubt on the statement of an ancient document, solely because that statement is inconsistent with his theory.

(2) Dr. Schürer accuses me of a second misstatement in respect of Mommsen's condemnation of his view. He says Mommsen merely condemns a part of his view, whereas I speak as if Mommsen had condemned the whole. Mommsen, it is true, speaks only of a part; but, with his condemnation of that part, the whole falls to the ground, so far as the criticism of Luke's accuracy is concerned.

(3) Dr. Schürer reiterates his own argument against Mommsen. I need not follow him, nor point out why I think his argument founded on a misconception. It is sufficient for the ordinary historical critic that, since Dr. Schürer's view is one for which even its author does not claim more than probability, and since part of it is pronounced by the highest authority on the subject to be "erroneous in every respect," its author has no right to cast doubt on a statement in an ancient author, merely because it does not conform to his view. Rather he should frankly admit that, since an author (who at the latest can hardly have flourished much more than a century after the

event, and who is universally acknowledged to have used some excellent contemporary¹ authorities) makes a statement inconsistent with his view, that view is thereby rendered too improbable to be worth stating in such a valuable work as Dr. Schürer's great treatise.

(4) On p. 470 Dr. Schürer assumes that the Italic cohort must necessarily have been stationed in Cæsarea if one of its centurions resided there: I have pointed out on p. 198 that this assumption goes beyond what our knowledge justifies us in *saying with certainty*, so long as the subject of detached service is so obscure.

(5) Every scholar who judges from facts and not from prejudice knows that an inscription, which proves the cohort to have been stationed in Syria in A.D. 69, constitutes a strong presumption in favour of an ancient authority who alludes to the cohort as being there about A.D. 40. Dr. Schürer on p. 470 says that "in my zeal I have entirely forgotten to say in how far the inscription could prove anything against him." I did not forget; I merely assumed that Dr. Schürer was familiar with the recognised facts and the accepted method of reasoning about the Roman army in the provinces. The whole burden of proof lies with him, if he argues that the cohort was moved into the province between 40 and 69, for it is well known that the Roman garrisons were not often moved, and that their occasional movements were caused by military requirements, which can usually be definitely ascertained.

Dr. Schürer alludes to "personal affronts" to himself, which he sees in my article. I fail to find anything in the article to which he refers that can be fairly styled disrespectful to him, unless it be an "affront" to him that I

¹ The most sceptical critics admit that the author had access to excellent authorities, and that most of his statements are correct in substance, though they consider them to be coloured and biased.

should venture to differ from him, or to think that Luke is correct where Dr. Schürer pronounces him to be in error.

Possibly, however, Dr. Schürer may see an "affront" in the words (the severest which I have used), "here and everywhere that Dr. Schürer touches on my own department of study, I find myself in opposition to his method of investigation." But is not that perfectly true? And, if it is true, why should it not be stated simply and honestly? If he is right, I am hopelessly and entirely wrong in the views which I have advocated about Luke, about Paul, about Phrygia, and about Galatia. I stake on them my whole reputation, my very existence, as a scholar: Dr. Schürer, on the contrary, might be proved wrong in reference to all these points, and yet remain a great and respected scholar. I take the risk; and I do so with perfect confidence in the issue. Has Dr. Schürer the same confidence? If he has, why treat an expression of dissent from his view as a "personal affront"? I have more than once referred to his opinions about the calculations in *Luke* iii. 1 and ii. 1, because it is obvious that they are so important as to be fundamental in the question. Luke's history rests on those passages: they show how the author tried to work his special subject into Roman history as a whole. If they are historically false, then every historical student will be slow to admit historical truth in the rest of the two books, except on the supposition that occasional good points have escaped maltreatment by a late redactor. I should have liked to state at least one argument on the subject, in order to avoid writing an article that contained nothing but discussion of points already discussed; but after seeing Dr. Schürer's *Reply* in the December number, no time remains for the purpose.

W. M. RAMSAY.