

that their contents must be made at all costs to correspond with an *a priori* theory of the Word of God, could scarcely fail to lead him a few steps in the direction of modern criticism, and had not Ibn Hazm's purpose been achieved when he had discredited the Gospels, he might have produced some positive conclusions of interest some 800 years out of due time. Thus the criticism which has been quoted on the story of Peter and the keys shows that he had in his hand the premises for a fruitful investigation which only fanaticism prevented him from conducting. His notions of the origin of the Pentateuch also resemble the conclusions of the most modern criticism in some curious ways ; for he could not be expected to anticipate the theory that Ezra was a myth. The passage, therefore, about Ezra which, in Wellhausen's opinion, had been strangely neglected as late as 1880 had already received a due share of attention in the Moslem criticism of the Bible of the eleventh century. D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

*NOTES ON RECENT NEW TESTAMENT STUDY.*

Two works in English, of different size and temper, have recently appeared upon the problem of Jesus Christ's life and teaching. The larger of these, *The Prophet of Nazareth* (1905), by Professor N. Schmidt, author of the scholarly articles on *The Son of Man* and *The Son of God* in the fourth volume of the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, is a series of studies on the historical and dogmatic significance of the person of Christ. The book is not a unity, nor is there any attempt to grapple exhaustively with the problems of the gospel history. The fifth and sixth chapters do little more than condense the articles already referred to, and it is only the ninth, tenth and eleventh which form a continuous contribution to the subject of the volume's title. Dr. Schmidt's position on the historicity of the Gospels approximates to

that of Brandt in its radical character. Thus he refuses to allow that Jesus ever called himself "the Son of Man," or that he used or received the title "Son of God." "If He conceived of the fatherhood of God and the sonship of man as universal, and avoided the temptation of assuming a special and unique relationship not attainable by others, it was because the genuineness of his experience and the righteousness of his moral disposition gave him a peculiarly clear vision of truth. So well did he realize his ideal of man as the child of the Father in heaven that men, fascinated by the spiritual beauty radiating from him, have gladly accorded him a title he never thought of claiming for himself, and have called him the Son of God" (pp. 156-157). In a misprinted note to p. 317 he criticizes Wellhausen for failing to do as much justice to the ethical ideas of Jesus as he does to the prophetic genius and religious teachings of the prophet of Nazareth. It is indeed upon the teaching, rather than on the history, of Jesus that Dr. Schmidt himself lays emphasis. Even in the story of the last days he is unable to admit that Jesus made a Messianic entry into Jerusalem. "The death on Calvary was not so tragic as such a surrender of his ideal would have been." Furthermore, owing to the legends which have gathered round Judas, "it is impossible to determine what part, if any, he had in helping the men to find Jesus. We have no reliable data from which to form a judgment of this man" (pp. 285-6). Dr. Schmidt also is unable to believe that Jesus ever celebrated the paschal meal, much less instituted the sacrament of the last supper, while the resurrection narratives, like the traditions of the Virgin-birth, are set aside as unhistorical.

Mr. T. A. Lacey's six popular lectures on *The Historic Christ* (1905, pp. 158) are a smaller, less detailed, and not

much more satisfactory volume by one who has caught something of Loisy's spirit. The first five lectures, a readable survey of the sources of the tradition, lay stress on Paul as a witness to the historic Jesus, partly because any deviation on his part from the primitive tradition would have been pounced upon by his opponents (pp. 41 f.). "There is no hint that anyone complained, for example, of his neglect of the Galilean life of Jesus, or disabled his gospel in consequence." Mr. Lacey, however, suggests that Paul's preaching of the Son of God tended "in practice to make for an imperfect apprehension of the real manhood of Jesus Christ" (pp. 60 f.), so that Peter's disciple, Mark, wrote his Gospel in order to bring out the real humanity of the Master. The whole synoptic tradition, in fact, was "in effect, if not in purpose, a necessary correction of a possible misunderstanding" due to an exaggeration of Paul's teaching in certain circles of the church. As for the Fourth Gospel, "you may say that whereas the other evangelists describe one scene of transfiguration, here we have a perpetual transfiguration, but the cloud is always at hand to dim the eyes of the beholder" (p. 72), the Divine Master being perpetually misunderstood. The dogmatic deductions are that the Johannine conception of Christ is equivalent to the Pauline, the Pauline to the primitive, and that the primitive is no other than that of Chalcedon. Unlike Loisy, Mr. Lacey adheres stoutly to the theory of an eye-witness behind the Fourth Gospel, whose historical value he upholds as against any symbolical evaporation.

The attempts made by several scholars recently, especially by Wendland (*Hermes*, 1898, pp. 175-179), H. Reich (*Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie*, 1894, pp. 705-33), and Vollmer (*Jesus u. das Sacäenopfer*, 1905), to trace the story of the

mocking of Jesus in the praetorium back to some pagan festival or tradition like that of the Sacaea, are discussed adversely in a recent number of *Hermes* (1906, pp. 220 f.) by Dr. J. Geffcken, who argues that the Saturnalian king has very few points of resemblance to the pseudo-king of the Jews. The possibility that Roman soldiers, even though they had served in the East, could have confounded the Sacaeian festival with their mockery of Jesus is denied outright. The Roman conscience was entirely opposed to human sacrifices in any case; even those of the Druids or of Saturnus were prohibited. And the Acta of Dasius, to which Wendland appeals for confirmation of the Saturnalia theory, are pronounced too untrustworthy to form a reliable piece of evidence. Nor does the well known scene, in which the Alexandrian populace ridiculed the Jewish Agrippa (Philo, *in Flacc.* 5-6), show that the gospel narrative is based on the conception of Jesus as a king of the mime. The Alexandrian mockery was levelled at Agrippa, not as a Jew, but as a king, and the Roman soldiers at Jerusalem can hardly have assimilated their treatment of Jesus to what they suddenly remembered of the mime-king of Alexandria. While refusing to accept such explanations of the tradition, Dr. Geffcken closes by admitting that the mockery of Jesus appears to him an elaboration and reiteration of certain elements in the previous scene of rejection before the Sanhedrim (Matt. xxvi. 68, Mark xiv. 65=Luke xxii. 64), the one representing the rejection of his prophetic, the other of his kingly rôle. If, as Brandt argues (*die evangelische Geschichte*, pp. 69 f.), the rejection before the council is partly to be explained as an elaboration of certain old Testament conceptions, the historicity of the subsequent mockery would lose some of its foundation also.

It is several years since Mr. Montefiore published his

study of Paul's Epistles in relation to Rabbinic Judaism. A similar appreciation, at once less acute and less sympathetic, is printed by Dr. Köhler, of Chicago, in the eleventh volume of the *Jewish Encyclopaedia* (1905, pp. 79-87), who traces back the Apostle's teaching, not to Rabbinic Judaism but to Alexandrian Hellenism. The critical basis of the article is most unsatisfactory. The Acts of Paul and Thecla are pronounced in some respects "of greater historic value than the canonical Acts of the Apostles"; Galatians ii.-iii. is dismissed as unreliable, as indeed are most passages of the Epistles or of Acts whenever they happen to contradict the author's preconceived ideas; and passages like 1 Thessalonians ii. 14b-16, 1 Corinthians xv. 56, and 2 Corinthians iii. 6, iv. 4 are arbitrarily set aside as interpolations. Dr. Köhler goes as far as he can with van Manen, stopping only when he feels that such hypercriticism would logically remove any figure of Paul from the range of such extraordinary charges as (i.) that the Apostle "substituted for the natural, childlike faith of man in God as the ever-present Helper in all trouble, a blind, artificial faith prescribed and imposed from without, and which is accounted as a meritorious act"; that (ii.) his doctrine of sin "robbed human life of its healthy impulses, the human soul of its faith in its own regenerating powers, of its belief in its own self and in its inherent tendencies to goodness"; (iii.) that in preferring faith and vision to reason and common sense "he opened wide the door to all kinds of mysticism and superstition"; and (iv.) that Paul's venomous hatred of the Jews was stronger and more characteristic than his panegyric on love in 1 Corinthians xiii.

In the latest number of the *Studien und Kritiken*, Herr. G. Kittel (pp. 419-36), after an exegetical study of the phrase *πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* in Paul's Epistles, concludes in favour

of the subjective sense of the question, following Haussleiter's lead in his *Der Glaube Jesu Christi u. der christliche Glaube, ein Beitrag zur Erklärung d. Römerbriefs* (1881). Professor S. McComb again has just defined Paul's characteristic view of faith as that "by which we assimilate and consummate Christ's redemptive work" (*Biblical World*, 1905, 292-99). Its essence is "absolute trust in, enthusiastic loyalty and devotion of heart to, Jesus as the Messiah and Son of God." Thus Paul's view of faith is formally different from the view of Jesus, who made faith simply "trust in God's fatherly goodness, whereby a man rises above all outward and inward impediments and achieves dominion over the forces of evil" (Matt. xvii. 20; Mark ix. 23; Luke xvii. 6). Paul identifies the object of faith with its organ. But in so doing he stands remote from the ecclesiastical notion: "submission of the intellect to authority ruins the very nerve of Paul's teaching, which in its highest form always emphasizes passionate self-surrender to a person." In this way, and in this way alone, the ethical interests of religion are conserved. "Faith is neither a substitute for conduct, nor an arbitrary condition of Christian living, but simply the latent instinct of sonship, awakened by Christ to self-consciousness."

JAMES MOFFATT.