

real sense from the re-foundation by Antiochus Epiphanes.

Now at last Tarsus had the status of an autonomous city, choosing its own magistrates and making its own laws, though doubtless subject in all foreign relations to the king. For its future history much depended on the new citizens and the terms of the new constitution ; and we must ask what evidence there is as to them.

W. M. RAMSAY.

NOTES ON RECENT NEW TESTAMENT STUDY.

A CAREFUL contribution to the study of early Christianity in its doctrinal aspect has just been made by Dr. W. Lütgert, the Halle scholar, in his monograph on *Love in the New Testament* (Leipzig, 1905). After two introductory chapters, the second of which lays stress on the influence of Hellenism in fostering such concepts as "virtue," "friendship," and "philanthropy," within pre-Christian Judaism, the author proceeds to discuss the New Testament teaching in detail. Paul and Jesus, he argues, were at one on this point. For, though the former laid exceptional stress on the mortification of one's natural affections in order to gain true love, the enemy of the latter was not for Paul, any more than for Jesus, merely hate, but that natural love which leads men to live to themselves and by themselves—the love of one's own soul and self which ruins life. To overcome this, Paul, no doubt, fell back on the death of Christ. But, Lütgert argues, even in the synoptic Gospels a similar method is assumed, for the elimination of self-love there is not only Christ's command, but His act. "Paul's conclusion, that fellowship with Jesus means fellowship with His death, and consequently the death of one's own Ego and the birth of love, amounts to the same thing as the saying of Jesus that following Him must involve the will to die,

and consequently self-denial." The main difference between the Pauline epistles and the synoptic Gospels is that the former are for the most part preoccupied with the problem of love's origin, the latter with its meaning. "The most original and simple expression of love to God is, for Paul, the desire to know Him" (cf. 1 Cor. viii. 3). "The connexion between love to God or Christ and love of Christians is never taken as self-evident. Love to the brethren does not rise naturally out of love to God and Christ. Rather, at this point, we have to do with an act of the will."

A special study in the method of "Orientalism" is given in Dieterich's *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* (1905, pp. 214–243) by Herr W. Köhler of Giessen, who attempts to show that Matthew xvi. 18–19 is not a genuine saying of Jesus, nor even an apostolic Jewish-Christian passage, but due to the conflict of early Christianity with the ancient world. The Jewish origin of the symbol of the keys, here and in Revelation i. 18, iii. 7–9, he thinks an unproven conjecture, principally on the ground that Judaism knew of no transference of the power of the keys from God to man; nor can he accept Sulzbach's recent Talmudic suggestion (in Preuschen's *Zeitschrift für die neuest. Wissenschaft*, iv. pp. 190–192) that Kepha (= כִּיפָה) was the name given to a chamber in the temple where the keys were carefully preserved. The real solution is sought in the familiar ancient conceptions of the temple keys borne by the priest or κλειδοῦχος, the heavenly keys borne by the Sun-God, and the keys of Hades, by which the gates of the lower world could be closed or opened. Now Κρόνος in the Gnostic syncretism, for example, bears μηνύον βασιλείαν. Other deities are credited with similar powers of opening the celestial privileges to men. Consequently, Köhler supposes, the early Church formed this conception of Peter as the true κλειδοῦχος

or bearer of the keys, in opposition to the rival claimant of the pagan mysteries : Kronos, Janus, Typhon Seth, and all the rest. Even the metaphor of *binding and loosing* is attributed not to Judaism, but to Gnostic syncretism, which furnishes, e.g., in the Pistis Sophia " a substantially authentic interpretation " of the Matthew saying, the interpretation being that, by baptism, the fetters of the demons are loosed from the sinner, who thus acquires an irrevocable passport to heaven.

The rapid and aggressive movements of " Orientalism " in the entire sphere of New Testament research, i.e., of the method which seeks to uncover the roots of early Christian beliefs and conceptions in the strata of ancient civilizations round the eastern basin of the Mediterranean, have elicited two attempts at a critical estimate of the method in general, one by Dr. Carl Clemen of Bonn (*Die religionsgeschichtliche Methode in der Theologie*), the other by Dr. J. M. S. Baljon of Utrecht in the *Studien und Kritiken* for January (1906), pp. 50-85. Both admit the legitimacy of the method, but question its fruitfulness. Both attribute it rightly to the dislike of an atomistic view of history, fostered by the doctrine of evolution in the religious sphere, and also by the recent opening up of fresh archaeological stores. But both scholars protest against the exaggerated claims put forward by Gunkel, Pfeiderer, and others, on behalf of the new key. The Dutch critic, who goes farther than the German in his opposition, admits the presence and influence of foreign conceptions only in the eschatological sphere, as, e.g., in the Book of Revelation, though he oddly refuses to allow that the seer, in writing chapter xii., was acquainted with the mythological origin of the symbols and pictures he employed in his sketch. The Buddhistic parallels and analogies are dismissed by Dr. Baljon (pp. 61-67), who

properly allows the possibility of a certain limited amount of influence from Mithraism (pp. 68–81) on primitive Christianity. But the parallels, however striking, are usually attributed by him to coincidence. The idea of the Magi in Matthew ii. representing the submission of Mithraism to Christianity he rules out of court as an anachronism before the end of the first century, while the striking affinities between the Hermes literature of Egypt and the doctrines of the Light and Logos in the Fourth Gospel (pp. 81–82) are also set aside.

Dr. Erich Haupt's appreciative review of Clemen's life of Paul, in the same magazine (pp. 141–156), declares that the latter's discussion of the Dutch school and their rejection of all the Pauline epistles may be now taken as the last word upon the subject, which is hardly too strong commendation. The reviewer breaks a lance, however, in defence of the North Galatian hypothesis. Paul, he points out, speaks in Galatians as though he were the sole founder of the churches, which does not fit in with the fact that he had companions during his first mission tour, to whom (as e.g. to Barnabas) it would have been natural for him to allude on the question of the law. Clemen's assertion that the Syrian Antioch (Gal. ii. 11) would not have required any addition, if the letter had been written in a district where there was another Antioch, is rejected. As for Acts xvi. 6 f. (omitting δὲ after ἐλθόντες), Haupt takes *καλυθέντες* very naturally as giving the reason of the following clause, i.e., explaining why, instead of labouring in Mysia they tried to enter Bithynia. If, as Haupt further points out, the missionaries were already in the province of South Galatia (xvi. 1 f.), one would naturally expect in verse 6 not a general term for the province, but a more special and narrow description of the particular district or locality. The whole paragraph

(v. 6 f.) really describes Paul hurrying through the churches he had already founded in search of a new field of operations, and this field, Haupt argues, lay in the territory, not in the province, of Galatia. As for the death of the Apostle, Haupt cannot believe it took place during the Neronic persecution. "It is far more likely, I think, that ere then the Jews had succeeded in getting rid of their hated opponent by means of the influence of Poppæa, who is known to have swayed Nero from 58 A.D. onwards."

Deissmann's views on the relation of the epistle to the letter in early Christian literature have been elaborated and re-stated by Dr. W. Soltau in volume xviii. of the *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum* (1906), pp. 17-29, where it is shown how the letter gradually evolved into the epistle, Cicero's correspondence reflecting the former, Seneca's the latter, stage. The author then traces the relationship between the epistle as a historical device (Acts xxiii. 26 f.) and the rise of epistolary pseudepigrapha, holding that the Catholic epistles of the New Testament all belong to the latter class, being religious tracts or short treatises thrown into epistolary form. The Pastoral epistles which, like Ephesians, are pronounced un-Pauline are dated c. 120 A.D.

A Roman Catholic study of the Epistle to the Hebrews has just appeared (*Verfasser u. Adresse des Briefes an die Hebräer*, Freiburg, 1905), in which the author, Bartholomäus Heigl, does his best to prove that language and style render the Pauline authorship possible, whilst tradition, which has the last word on such a subject (p. 58), puts it beyond question. Written to the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem after the death of James, the epistle is designed to stay a threatened relapse to the older faith. A similar

thesis is advocated by J. S. F. Chamberlin (*The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 1904), who thinks the epistle was originally addressed to Jews by a prominent Christian, possibly by Paul himself, though afterwards it was re-edited by a Christian to suit a Gentile Christian church. Professor Blau has also followed up his study of the artistic rhythm in the prose style of the epistle (*Studien u. Kritiken*, 1902, pp. 420-461) by some fresh paragraphs in his monograph on *Die Rhythmen der asianischen u. römischen Kunstprosa* (1905), pp. 41-42, 78 f., 87 f., especially in view of the newly discovered fragment among the Oxyrhynchite papyri.

The inner criticism of the Fourth Gospel, and indeed of the New Testament in general, but especially of the Gospels, has received a notable contribution in Dr. E. A. Abbott's *Johannine Vocabulary* (1906), which forms the fifth part of his *Diatessarica* and a sequel to his *Johannine Grammar* of last year. There is perhaps less for the expositor and preacher here than in the preceding volume, but more for the exegete and student. The examination of the language and conceptions, conducted with a subtlety of insight and thoroughness of investigation which are beyond all praise, rests on the principle that "the LXX., the Synoptists, the New Testament as a whole, Epictetus, and the Papyri of 50-150 A.D." are "safer guides than writers of the third century and far safer than those of the fourth" to an elucidation of the Johannine thought. The writer of the Gospel is, to Dr. Abbott, "a master of style and phrase, as well as an inspired prophet," and "an honest man (a fact that some commentators hardly seem to recognize), writing indeed some seventy years or more after the Crucifixion, but still with some knowledge of what he wrote about, and with some sense of responsibility to those for whom he wrote" (pp. x.-xi.). One can only chronicle one or two

of Dr. Abbott's findings. The words *πρῶτός μου* ("He was before me") in i. 15 and i. 30 (cf. xv. 18) are held to mean "My First" (§§ 1896 f., 2665 f.), i.e., "The First-born of God, the object of my worship" (cf. Rev. i. 17, xxii. 13). In support of the interpretation of *ἀνωθεν* as = "from above" in iii. 3-7, the author observes that "Nicodemus was familiar with the doctrine of 'new birth,' applied to baptized proselytes, and he knew that very often it did not mean much." Hence, in view of Christ's remark in Matthew xxiii. 15, "that a proselyte—who was compared by the Jews to a new-born child—might be made a *child of hell*," it was "necessary to emphasize the truth that regeneration must be *from above*" (§ 1908). On xv. 16 Dr. Abbott has this fine comment: "'Fruit,' as always in John, means the vintage and harvest of souls, which elsewhere the Apostles are said to 'reap.'" Why, then, does the sentence not end with *that your fruit may abide*, instead of proceeding to add: *that whatsoever ye ask the Father in My Name He may give you*? Because, the writer suggests, after a grammatical discussion of *ἵνα*, the clause "reminds the Apostles that the more they succeed, the more they must remember that their success depends on God's answer to their prayers, and—since divine answer to human prayer depends on human unity with divine will—on the oneness of their will with His" (§ 2122). In passages like vi. 20, the words *I am* are also interpreted as meaning not "I am myself, Jesus," but in the deeper sense, suggested by the LXX. translation *ἐγώ εἰμι* of the Hebraic phrase, of "I am the Saviour" (§§ 2220 f.). Finally, in the section on "Twofold Meanings and Events," it is pointed out that "To Andrew and Andrew's nameless companion the Lord says, *What seek ye*? After the life of the Incarnate Son is closed on earth, and when the disciples have gained through sorrow and tears new insight into what that life has been, the voice of the

risen Saviour utters, as its first words to Mary, 'Why weepest thou? *Whom seekest thou?*' There are passages in the Old Testament and Philo that indicate how this question might be traditionally regarded as one of mystical meaning."

Of less importance is a fresh attempt, made along the lines followed by Wuttig and Küppers, to solve the Johanne problem by relegating the Fourth Gospel to the seventh decade of the first century. Herr H. Gebhardt (*Die Abfassungszeit des Joh.-evangeliums*, 1906), the author of this essay, regards the Gospel, or rather chapters i.-xx., as composed by John the apostle in Ephesus during 64-66 A.D., in order to confirm Gentile Christians in their belief. The historical element is referred not to any acquaintance with the synoptic Gospels, but to independent oral traditions possessed by the writer. The last chapter (xxi.) was written slightly later by Andrew and Philip—as Haussleiter had already suggested.

JAMES MOFFATT.

OLD TESTAMENT NOTES.

WILKE'S *Jesaja und Assur* (Leipzig, 1905) is an elaborate study of Isaiah's policy during the Assyrian campaigns. In a number of passages the prophet is neutral, if not friendly disposed to Assyria, whereas in another series his standpoint is changed and he hurls his prophecies against one whom he formerly regarded as Yahweh's instrument. How to explain Isaiah's attitudes is the problem which Wilke proceeds to handle. In his discussion of the political history of the period he works on independent lines. The evidence of the Assyrian inscriptions cannot be taken implicitly without criticism; ancient Oriental policy (as Winckler