

THE
CHURCHMAN

NOVEMBER, 1902.

ART. I.—RECENT LITERATURE IN RELATION TO
THE WITNESS AND WORK OF ST. PAUL.—II.

THE Epistle which of all others is at present exciting the most attention is, perhaps, the Epistle to the Galatians. But this interest is not concerned with its authenticity—few, as I have said, care to dispute that—but with its date.

When an Epistle has been assigned a place as possibly the earliest or latest of all the Epistles of St. Paul, it is obviously difficult to fix the time of its writing with certainty. But at the present moment there is a somewhat growing tendency to assign a very early place to the writing in question—*e.g.*, in Germany, Dr. Zahn, Clemen, and Weber; in America, Dr. McGiffert and Professor Bacon; and in our own country, Mr. Rendall and Mr. V. Bartlet, have all recently maintained that the Epistle should rank as the first and earliest which we owe to St. Paul.

The most elaborate exposition of this view is set forth by Professor Weber, of Würzburg, in his "Die Abfassung des Galaterbriefs vor dem Apostelkonzil," 1900 (and subsequently in a shorter form, 1901). He places the composition of Galatians at Antioch in the interval referred to in Acts xiv. 28, between the return of St. Paul from his first missionary journey and the meeting of the Apostolic Council, in the succeeding chapter (xv.).¹

Of course, this note of time involves the acceptance of the South Galatian theory, so brilliantly advocated in England by

¹ This paper is printed in the form in which it was delivered in the early part of the year, so that no reference is made to the article on Weber's book in the July number of the *Journal of Theological Studies*, or to the recent change of date assigned to the *Book of Jubilees* by Dr. Charles.

Professor Ramsay, and previously maintained in England, France, and Germany by other writers.

This theory, with the main arguments of which you are doubtless acquainted, has been recently attacked by Professor Schmiedel ("Encyclopædia Biblica," vol. ii., "Galatia"). Schmiedel, amongst other things, is concerned to maintain that we cannot be sure that St. Paul always speaks of geographical terms according to their official Roman usage, and whilst he admits some of Ramsay's instances, he alleges that the rest prove nothing.

But Schmiedel has nothing definite to say against what Ramsay calls the "most striking example of Paul's habit of using Roman names"—viz., Rom. xv. 19, where we find the Apostle transcribing the Roman word *Illyricum* by a Greek word, *Illyrikon*, used nowhere else as a noun, but always as an adjective, the Greeks employing another name to correspond to *Illyricum*.

There can, therefore, be little doubt that the Apostle is using a Roman term, as is shown by the very form of the word, and there can also be little doubt that *Illyricum* was employed in official Roman usage. Thus we find *superior provincia Illyricum* (see "Dalmatia" in "Encyclopædia Biblica," vol. i.).

Schmiedel's learned countryman, Dr. Zahn, has no doubt that the Apostle is here using *Illyricum* in its Roman provincial sense ("Einleitung," i. 131).

But if we are prepared to admit that St. Paul may have employed the term "Galatia" in this same official sense, then it becomes difficult to see why he should not speak of its inhabitants under the collective term "Galatians."

This possibility is fully admitted by some writers who do not accept the South Galatian theory, as, e.g., Sieffert in his edition of Meyer's "Galatians." A great authority—Professor Mommsen—in a recent article, to which we must again refer, in the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Heft 2, 1901, has said that in common speech the inhabitants of Iconium and Lystra could not be called "Galatians." But by what other collective title would St. Paul have addressed them? If he speaks of "Churches of Galatia," why not Galatians, just as he speaks of Churches in the province of Macedonia as Churches of Macedonia, and of their members as Macedonians? Mommsen himself has elsewhere pointed out (see Hastings' Bible Dictionary, vol. ii., 92) that the national designation of "Lycaonian" or "Phrygian" was a servile one, applied to slaves and horses. But men belonging to Roman colonies and semi-Roman towns would be proud of the provincial title "Galatians." St. Paul, with his statesmanlike

method, with his ideal of imperial unity, would be just the man to employ it. The Roman historian, Tacitus ("Ann.," xv. 6), speaks of "Galatarum Auxilia," and the Roman citizen Paul might well have adopted the same term (see "Encyclopædia Biblica," vol. ii., 1593).

But I have thus touched upon the South Galatian theory, not merely for its critical or geographical value, not so much for its close union with that conception of St. Paul's statesmanlike policy which prompted him to evangelize the Roman Empire, and with this purpose in view to work mainly in the towns, to keep to the highways, to mark the centres of government—a conception so strikingly delineated, not only by Professor Ramsay, but by Dr. Lock of Keble in "St. Paul the Master Builder"—but because it may be connected with another fact of primary importance. Professor Ramsay draws out with great skill the points of likeness between the Epistle to the Galatians and St. Paul's address at the Pisidian Antioch, Acts xiii. ("Galatians," p. 401). If the members of the Church in the latter were included under the term "Galatians," this is just what we might expect.

There is one remarkable verse (Gal. iv. 4) with which Ramsay compares the words of the address at Antioch: "But when the fulness of the time came, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the law."

"It is clear," says Ramsay, "that the teaching so briefly summed up in this verse is to be understood as already familiar to the Galatians. Paul is merely revivifying it in their memory" (p. 397). Ramsay, I venture to think, goes too far in taking the words of the address, "To us is this word of salvation sent forth," as referring to the same teaching as that contained in the verse just quoted, although the verb "sent forth" in both places is the same. The expression "word of salvation," however, does not seem to be used here in the mystical sense, as Ramsay thinks, of the Word in the fourth Gospel.

But, quite apart from this, it is most important to note that Ramsay speaks of Gal. iv. 4 as a summary of facts which were already previously known.

The sum and substance of the Apostolic preaching was "Jesus is the Christ"; but how could this thesis be proved unless the hearers, whether Jews or Gentiles, had before them a clear and accurate knowledge of the claims of Jesus, and of the fulfilment by Him of the Messiahship?

If we read the Apostolic letters carefully, always remembering that they are *letters* (and not so much *epistles*, the products of literary art, if we may draw the distinction of Dr. Deissmann), the wonder is, not how little they contain of reference

to the *life* of Jesus, but how much—and how much, too, they presuppose.

This is admitted in quarters where we might least expect it. If any one, *e.g.*, will read the most recent "Leben Jesu" in Germany by O. Holtzmann, he will be surprised to note how many are the references in St. Paul's Epistles which the writer finds to the details and the significance of the human life of Jesus.

I had hoped to have given some of these details, but time presses.

From another point of view, however, the subject will be found amply discussed by Zahn ("Einleitung," vol. ii, 162, 166). The article in the new edition of Herzog ("Jesus Christus") is of great value in tracing a similar series of references; whilst amongst older writers, anyone who turns to the English translation of Keim's "History of Jesus" will again be surprised to find how one of the most reverent of negative critics sees what is practically "a fifth Gospel" in the Epistles of St. Paul.

Whether Ramsay is right in maintaining, as recently in the *Sunday-School Times* of America, that St. Paul had actually seen in Jerusalem the Jesus with whose fame the whole city and all Judæa were ringing, I do not venture to say. But one thing may be said—that the trend of much of the recent discussions as to the chronology of St. Paul's life is clearly to place his conversion within a year or so after the Crucifixion. And this fact may in itself suggest more than one important inference. But, at the same time, there is a satisfactory reason from another point of view as to why the references to the human *life* of Jesus are not *more* obvious and *more* numerous. "Even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more" (2 Cor. v. 16). The words need not mean that St. Paul was indifferent to the facts of the human life of Jesus; the context shows what they do mean. St. Paul is contrasting a knowledge of Christ (not Jesus) after the flesh with the knowledge which enables a man to say that he is in Christ—that he is a new creature; in other words, he regards Christ no longer as a Jew, but as a Christian would regard Him, not as one whose thoughts were fixed upon a material kingdom or upon an earthly Messiah, but upon a Christ living in the hearts of men, reigning in His Church, not after the flesh, but after the spirit.

There was, again, a further reason why the events of the human life of Jesus are not more frequently traced in the Epistles.

Men lived, St. Paul and his converts lived, not only in the present rather than in the past, but in the future; the present could not be separated from the future.

The first chapter of probably St. Paul's earliest Epistle—1 Thessalonians—tells us that Christians were to wait for God's Son from heaven: the Apostle's hope and joy: What was it? "Are not even ye before our Lord Jesus at His coming?"

And yet even that absorbing expectation of our Lord's return was not divorced from, but was rather sustained by, the teaching of the Jesus of the Gospels. The word used by the Apostle for "coming," or rather "presence," is the very word used by Jesus of the same event as He discoursed on the Mount of Olives before His passion.

And no one can read 1 Thess. v. without constantly catching, as it were, the echoes of that same great discourse.

It is surely a testimony of no little worth, not only to the vitality of our Lord's sayings, but to the abiding power of His Personality, that within such a brief space of time after His death such statements should be accepted and believed, and that such claims should be acknowledged and revered.

In his famous "What is Christianity?" no one has emphasized more than Dr. Harnack that St. Paul was the Apostle who most understood Christ and carried on His work.

He speaks of him as the man who carried out the boldest enterprise—the breaking down of the barrier between Jew and Gentile—"without being able to appeal to a single word of his Master."

But whence does Dr. Harnack gain his knowledge of St. Paul's inability in this respect? The Apostle elsewhere is able to distinguish between his own opinion and a plain and decisive command of the Lord; he is able to take his stand upon the acts and sayings of Jesus in relation to subjects of such vital importance as the atoning death and the future advent of the Lord. It is therefore somewhat dogmatic to limit his knowledge. We may at least affirm that St. Paul must have been aware that in his character of the Apostle of the Gentiles no *positive* sayings of Jesus could be quoted against him; but if he was not acquainted with the discourses of Jesus, what guarantee had he but that at any moment some Judaizing Christian would affirm that Jesus had proclaimed: "Unless they keep the law of Moses no Gentile shall enter My Church."

And if the Apostle was a mere visionary, what a temptation to support by appeal to the words of a vision his own view of the admission of the Gentiles!

He never does so; and in that restraint there lies no small proof of his soberness and candour (see "Keim," *ut supra*, vol. iii., 583).

But St. Paul's "witness" to his own work is borne not only

by his own letters, but by the accounts which we owe to the Evangelist St. Luke.

Reference has already been made to Mommsen's recent criticism and rejection of the South Galatian theory, but in the same article the great historian tells us that we have in the account in Acts of the missionary labours of Paul, for the most part, a contemporary and trustworthy historical narrative; he allows that there is no important difference between the narrative of St. Luke and St. Paul's own references to his life in his Epistles; he expresses his surprise at the wonderful honesty of the story under the circumstances, as the writer is evidently a Hellenist and a staunch supporter of Paul; he points to the countless small details which are not required for the actual course of the history, and yet fit so well into it; he blames Weizsäcker for supposing that the account of the trial of St. Paul before Felix, and again before Festus, is simply a repetition by the writer of the same event, and that one trial or the other was a mere invention; nothing is more credible, he says, than that the accusations made under one governor should be repeated under another, especially as the first process had led to no definite result, and obviously the two trials would present analogous features; above all, he is struck with the circumstance that St. Luke by no means passes over facts which might seem of doubtful credit to the Apostle, as, *e.g.*, his appeal to the division in the Sanhedrin between the Pharisees and the Sadducees; he is impressed with the care of the historian to represent both Jews and Jewish Christians as keeping fast in Jerusalem to Jewish ordinances, and especially with the simple reference of St. Paul before Felix to the object of his great mission journey as simply undertaken for the management of the collection for the poor (Acts xxiv. 17).

Amongst other points of interest in Mommsen's article he refers in a note (p. 83) to Sergius Paulus, and he is inclined to admit that the mention on an inscription in Rome of a date fairly corresponding to the narrative in Acts of a certain Sergius Paulus as one of the curators of the Tiber, a man of pretorian rank, refers to the Sergius Paulus of Acts xiii.

It is perhaps somewhat strange that Mommsen should apparently prefer this piece of evidence when identification may be established on more intelligible grounds. Pliny, *e.g.*, in his "Natural History," mentions a certain Sergius Paulus (according to the reading preferred by Lightfoot) as a chief authority for Books II. and XVIII., and each of the two books, strikingly enough, does contain special information about Cyprus, of which the Sergius Paulus of the Acts is described as proconsul. The connection of the "Gens Sergia" with Cyprus

is strikingly confirmed, as Zahn points out, by a recently discovered inscription in the island; whilst Hogarth has deciphered more accurately another inscription which had already been partly made public, containing apparently the words, "Paul, proconsul."

The whole evidence is collected by Zahn ("Einleitung," ii. 633), and McGiffert's note, "Apostolic Age," p. 175, is of interest.

It would seem, indeed, that even the most arbitrary and depreciatory criticism of the historical character of Acts is constrained to bear testimony to St. Luke's remarkable accuracy in connection with this and other details.

"After every deduction has been made," writes Schmiedel in his article "Acts," ("Encyclopædia Biblica," vol. i., 47), "Acts certainly contains many data that are correct, especially in the matter of proper names, such as Jason, Titius Justus, Crispus, Sosthenes, or in little touches such as the title *politarch* (xvii. 6), which is verified by inscriptions from Thessalonica, as in the title of 'chief man' (xxviii. 7) for Malta, and probably the name of Sergius Paulus as proconsul of Cyprus (xiii. 7)."

An admirable summary of St. Luke's accuracy in all parts of his book will be found in the Introduction to Mr. Rackham's recently published volume, and when we consider that St. Luke's history deals with a subject beyond any other the most intricate and confusing—that of the government of the Roman Empire and of its provinces—our wonder is the greater that his accuracy should be so complete, and so increasingly confirmed.

Professor Mommsen, it is true, does not extend to the whole of Acts his commendation of the accounts of the missionary journeys. But it is, perhaps, a little curious that he should refer for the general character of the book to the German philologist, Gercke (see p. 128 of Zöckler, "Greifswalder Studien"), who rejects, it is true, the rest of Acts in comparison with the "we" sections (Acts xvi. 10-17; xx. 5-15; xxi. 1-18; xxvii. 1; xxviii. 16), but who pours scorn upon the extraordinary attempt of various writers to break up the book amongst different authors, whilst he points very forcibly to the entire arbitrariness which characterizes their methods. In this we may entirely and heartily agree with him.

Professor Schmiedel, again, is prepared to admit that the "we" sections are from an eye-witness, whilst he refuses to admit that they come to us from the same hand as that to which we owe the rest of the book.

Here language, identity of style (*cf.* Sir J. Hawkins, and *Church Quarterly Review* for October, 1901), medical

phraseology,¹ to say nothing of Church tradition, are all against him; and all this remains, even if we ignore the fact that such a skilful writer as the author of the third Gospel and of the Acts would not have allowed the "we" sections to remain as they are, unless we are also prepared to believe with Schmiedel that he left the pronoun "we" untouched with the deliberate purpose of passing himself off as the author of the whole book.

If so, it was a clumsy, no less than an unworthy, effort.

But if we are ready to admit that the writer of the "we" sections is identical with the writer of the rest of the work, then we must remember that these "we" sections, so lifelike, so full of detail, so marked by closeness of observation and accuracy of terminology, are also full of the miraculous.

Take as a single instance the famous shipwreck chapter (xxvii.). What can be more arbitrary than Holtzmann's attempt to eliminate certain sections because they purport to describe miraculous events?

These passages in chapters xxvii. and xxviii. are closely connected with the general narrative; they are characterized by the same medical terms, and by a similar accuracy of detail.

"The miraculous cures in Malta," writes Weizsäcker, "are an historically inseparable portion of the Apostle's life." It is a remarkable admission in relation to the subject before us, although the same critic is evidently sceptical as to the nature of the cures, and believes that their narration served as a model for the exaggerations in other portions of the book.

But might it not be said with great fairness that if we find in the "we" sections evidence of trustworthiness and carefulness combined inseparably with a belief in the miraculous, we ought not to be surprised to find—nay, rather, we might expect to find—the same combination elsewhere?

And if so, why should we suppose that the writer, who could be so accurate in describing, say, the riot at Ephesus—a description confirmed by a host of inscriptions—should have taken no trouble to inquire as to the nature and number of the miracles—the special miracles as they are called—which were wrought in Ephesus by the agency of Paul (xix. 11)?

But it is not simply in the rejection of the miraculous element in its pages that we have just cause to complain of

¹ Since this was written, Dr. Hobart, the well-known author of *The Medical Language of St. Luke*, has passed to his rest. It is of interest to note that during the last few months the value of his work has been further endorsed by Dr. P. Ewald in Germany, and by Dr. Chase in England.

the arbitrary methods adopted by advanced critics with regard to this Book of Acts.

The same arbitrariness and subjectivity are manifest even in relation to passages where we might well be surprised to find them.

Take as a single instance St. Paul's address to the elders at Miletus (Acts xx.).

The address is inferior to no part of the book, not even to chapter xxvii. in vividness of expression and intensity of feeling, and yet we are asked by the partition critics to believe that the whole speech is the work of one or more redactors!

Thus, the first half of ver. 19 is the work of one redactor, the latter part of the same verse is the work of another redactor, R. anti-Judaicus, because it mentions plots of the Jews. Vers. 26, 27 are to be regarded as an editorial gloss because they break the connection between the counsel of ver. 28 and the motive expressed in ver. 25. Vers. 33-35 are to share the same fate, because the prayer mentioned in ver. 36 ought to follow directly upon ver. 32.

That is to say, the whole of St. Paul's exquisite appeal: "I coveted no man's silver or gold or apparel. Ye yourselves know that these hands ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me. In all things I gave you an example how that so labouring ye ought to help the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how He Himself said: It is more blessed to give than to receive"—the whole of this appeal is to be omitted, because the Apostle has previously said: "And now I commend you to God and to the word of His grace"; and because at the end of the speech we read: "And when he had thus spoken he kneeled down, and prayed with them all." The *prayer* according to the critics must have followed directly upon the *commendation*.

The same English writer, Mr. Moffatt, who in his learned "Historical New Testament" apparently endorses these extraordinary glosses, has also thought fit to endorse a comment made upon a recent English Commentary on the Acts, that so long as the criticism of sources is discounted, there will remain the element of unreality and artificial combination which haunts one's mind in reading typical English work.

I would venture to take up these very same phrases, and to affirm that this element of unreality and artificial combination not only haunts but possesses one's mind in reading theories, which are for the most part not merely made, but often enough unmade and remade, in Germany, evolved out of the writer's own inner consciousness, without a single jot or tittle of support from any documental evidence whatever.

In reading, not without some impatience, these partition

theories, one is irresistibly reminded of some remarks of Charlotte Brontë by W. S. Williams in Shorter's "Charlotte Brontë and Her Circle," p. 169 :

"How I laugh in my sleeve when I read the solemn assertion that 'Jane Eyre' was written in partnership, and that it bears the mark of more than one mind and one sex !

"The wise critics would certainly sink a degree in their own estimation if they knew that your or Mr. Smith's was the first masculine hand that touched the manuscript of 'Jane Eyre,' and that till you or he read it no masculine eye had scanned a line of its contents, no masculine ear had heard a phrase from its pages.

"However, if they like, I am not unwilling they should think a dozen ladies and gentlemen aided at the compilation of the book.

"Strange patchwork it must seem to them; this chapter being penned by Mr. and that by Miss or Mrs. Bell ; that character or scene being delineated by the husband, that other by the wife, the gentleman, of course, doing the rough work, the lady getting up the finer parts. I admire the idea vastly."

But once more : If it is true to say that Christianity has been from the beginning, not book religion, but life, this surely may be said of the witness and work of St. Paul. Behind them both was a conversion, and that conversion brought St. Paul into relationship with a life. No one has helped to emphasize this more than Dr. Harnack : "Above all, Jesus was felt to be the active principle of individual life." "It is not I that live, but Christ that liveth in me," he adds, quoting the words of St. Paul. Mr. Moffatt, in the second edition of his recent book, gives us, as it were, a commentary upon such words by quoting those pathetic lines of the late Principal Shairp :

"I have a life with Christ to live,
But ere I live it, must I wait
Till learning can clear answer give
Of this or that book's date ?

"I have a life in Christ to live,
I have a death in Christ to die,
And must I wait till science gives
All doubts a full reply ?"

But that phrase "in Christ," what does it mean ? what does it involve ? It may possibly have been a creation of St. Paul himself ; it may carry us back to the very words of the Lord Jesus.

But whatever its origin, it is at all events significant that it was always related by St. Paul to a glorified Christ.

The Pauline Gospel of the Infancy (Gal. iv. 4) was truly a Gospel, because while it spoke so clearly of a historical Christ it spoke also of a Divine Christ, and the witness and the work of St. Paul could only have been sustained in the strength of One who was for him in his earliest, as in his latest, Epistles his Saviour, his Judge, his Lord, with whom his life on earth was hidden, and with whom he would one day be manifested in glory :

“Yea, through life, death, through sorrow, and through sinning,
He shall suffice me, for He hath sufficed :
Christ is the end, for Christ was the beginning,
Christ the beginning, for the end is Christ.”

They are the words of one whose death in the last year was probably marked by us all—an unexpected loss which adds pathos to the utterance—F. W. Myers in his “St. Paul.”

R. J. KNOWLING.

ART. II.—TIGLATHPILESER, KING OF BABYLON—
THE KEY TO ISAIAH XIII. 1 TO XIV. 27.—II.

THE accession of Shalmaneser in the same month in which his predecessor died suggests that the crown passed by succession from one to the other—in fact, that Shalmaneser was the son of Tiglathpileser. A further proof of this is obtainable as follows: On the Second Dynastic Tablet from Babylon¹ both Tiglathpileser and Shalmaneser are called by their private names, Pulu and Ululai respectively, a familiarity which argues some previous connection with Babylon. But whereas the name Pulu stands without any addition, Ululai is described as “of the dynasty of Tinu.” In the same way no dynasty is affixed to the name of the usurper Sargon, whilst his son Sennacherib is styled as “of the dynasty of Khabi the greater.”² If, then, it be granted that Shalmaneser was the son of Tiglathpileser, it follows that the dynasty of the usurper came to a close just five years after his death, when the great Sargon mounted the throne of Assyria, and became the founder of a fresh dynasty, embracing four great Kings, who reigned in direct succession—Sargon, Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, and Assurbanipal.

¹ “Records of the Past,” New Series, vol. i., p. 18.

² According to H. Winckler the above surmise is now an established fact. Shalmaneser is found styled the son of Tiglathpileser in a treaty made between Esarhaddon and Baal of Tyre. See Schrader’s “Keilinschriften,” third edition, part i., p. 62, footnote 2.