is tending, and what points yet remain to be cleared up. A fresh inscription, belonging to the period under discussion, or a fragment of official correspondence on Egyptian papyrus, might very well settle the points that are still in debate one way or the other. As far as we have gone, the evidence is running very strongly in favour of the belief that Luke has given us a correct historical background for his Gospel.

J. Rendel Harris.

The New Schürer.

It is twenty-two years since the English translation of Schürer's monumental Geschichtedes Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi was published in Clark's Foreign Theological Library. Much water has flowed under the bridges since then; even since the issue of the third German edition in 1898, inscriptions, manuscripts, and papyri, have come in like a flood upon the historian. Fresh points of view have been urged by specialists in the internal and the external history of the period, and Dr. Schürer, with painstaking thoroughness, has not been slow to chronicle and estimate such contributions. The result is that we have now before us a fourth edition of the second volume (Leipzig, 1907, pp. 680), dealing with the internal conditions of the period. This covers §§ 22–30, which in the original English edition occupy the whole of volume i. and the first 218 pages of volume ii. (Division ii.). For the benefit of those who possess the latter, as well as for the sake of surveying some of Schürer's mature judgments upon the problems in question, it may be useful to notice a few of the more salient changes, in the way of addition or of alteration, which the learned author has introduced. These are usually
incorporated in the footnotes, but now and then the text has been modified or corrected.

Naturally, some of the most significant changes occur in the social and geographical sections (§§ 22–23), which are crammed with minutiae and references to recent literature upon the spread of Hellenism within the confines of Palestine. From Schürer’s wealth of detail, it is serviceable to turn to Wendland’s fine summary (pp. 103 f.) in his recent essay on Die Hellenistisch-Römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum (1907). On two special points the English reader may also supplement Schürer by a reference to Mr. Herbert Rix’s volume Tent and Testament (1907), where the bright, popular descriptions of the theatres at Gadara (pp. 134 f.) and of the site of Pella¹ (pp. 146 f.) fill out the concise statements of the German scholar on pp. 51 and 176.

It is more interesting, however, to notice the general estimate of the inner condition of the Jews, upon which the external arguments converge. Here Dr. Schürer shows least sign of having abandoned or even altered, to any material degree, his former judgment. Thus upon one crucial point he remains evidently impenitent. Objection has been taken to his statements upon the laws of cleanness and uncleanness, by several writers, including Mr. C. J. Montefiore (Hibbert Lectures, pp. 477 f.) and Dr. A. Büchler (Der galiläische ‘Am-ha Ares des zweiten Jahrhunderts, 1906, pp. 126 f.), who contend that the picture drawn of average Jewish piety is exaggerated in colour and outline. These critics do not deny the complicated scheme of the ceremonial ordinances, with their tendency to externalism.

¹ Mr. Rix explains that, so far from being a retired and obscure place, Pella was situated on a principal trade-route. “Even to-day” the Decapolis, instead of being uncivilized or provincial, “exhibits the most remarkable remains of Greek civilization which Palestine can show.”
and anxious formalism. But they enter a caveat against any sweeping inferences from this feature. They maintain that no layman was bound to keep these ordinances, which applied to the priests alone. Furthermore, it is argued by Büchler that they cannot be shown to have operated in Judaea during the lifetime of Jesus. Schürer, so far as I have observed, does not allude to Mr. Montefiore,¹ but he sees as little in Büchler’s view to-day as he did last year when he reviewed that author’s essay in the Theologische Litteraturzeitung (1906, 619–620). The tractate Kelim, as he showed then, fails to support any such distinction between the priests and the laity, nor does the consensus of Jewish commentators side with Büchler. Thus the severe verdict upon such trivial enactments which the Gospels put into the lips of Jesus (Matt. xv. 2; Mark vii. 2f.; Luke xi. 38–39) is pronounced by Dr. Schürer to be historically valid (pp. 560–565, Eng. tr. 106–111). It is significant that even Mr. Montefiore, while pleading that “these distinctions and rules did not concern the layman, and are themselves merely the written precipitate of the discussions of the schools, and were probably unknown to nine-tenths of the pious and observant Israelites in the age of Christ,” at once adds that “the existence of a large priesthood who were bound to follow out the rules of clean and unclean to the utmost of their knowledge and capacity, and the existence of an extreme section of Rabbis who even sought to outdo these professional observers, were grave evils. These puerile prescriptions not only interfered with social intercourse, but tended to set up a false ideal of external sanctity.”

On the question of prayer, Dr. Schürer remains equally unmoved (pp. 569–572, Eng. tr. 115–118) by the protest

¹ Not here, at any rate. But on pp. 468–471 he rejects the English scholar’s view that Chaberim and Peruschim are not the same.
of Mr. Montefiore (op. cit. pp. 505 f.). The latter takes sharp exception to the statement that Judaism, in the age of Jesus, had already begun to deaden piety by confining prayer within the fetters of a rigid mechanism, treating it often casuistically and formally. Some proofs for this statement are certainly taken from prominent rabbis of the primitive age. One must grant so much to Schürer. But is it quite fair to infer from them more than a tendency? Popular piety is surely often superior to the professional or theological theories of its practice, and Dr. Schürer here seems scarcely sympathetic enough. It is generally hazardous to infer the actual state of contemporary religion from documents, and a due allowance for this fact would probably tend to modify the somewhat unbalanced conclusions which the Jewish scholar properly resents.

A similar lack of flexibility is to be felt in the well-known characterization of Jewish piety as eudæmonistic and utilitarian (pp. 547 f.), which remains unaltered from the earlier editions (Eng. tr. ii. p. 93), in spite again of Mr. Montefiore's argument to the contrary (op. cit. pp. 532 f.), and of Mr. Schechter's exposition (Jewish Quarterly Review, 1894–1897).

At the same time it is doubtful if any reasonable concession or qualification on this line would invalidate the trustworthiness of what the synoptic Gospels describe with regard to the piety and practice of the scribes and Pharisees in the time of Jesus. One signal merit of Schürer's work is that it corroborates from the historical side the leading features of that description; if the German scholar's arguments might have been put occasionally with less rigour,¹ they are nevertheless superior in insight to the opposite view, urged in these latter days by Jewish writers like Rabbi

¹ Dr. Allan Menzies has indicated this in a brief article in the Hibbert Journal (vol. i. pp. 789–792), replying to Mr. Montefiore's previous complaint (ibid., 335–346) about the silence of Christian scholars upon Jewish scholarship.
Ziegler (Der Kampf zwischen Judentum und Christentum in den drei ersten Jahrhunderten, 1907), which, by ignoring the successive periods of early Jewish and rabbinical development, would seek to discredit in toto the unsympathetic statements of the synoptic Gospels upon the scribes and Pharisees. Thus, in spite of all pleading to the contrary, Schürer does seem to have got hold of the right sense of the term *Chaber*. In the Mishna, as he argues, it means "one who strictly keeps the law, including the *παραδόσεις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*, i.e. it is equivalent to "Pharisee." Now this lets us see deep into the estimate which Pharisaism cherished of its own position. As distinguished from the common people, the Pharisees are the *chaberim*, the brethren of the covenant, who represent the real community of Israel. According to the Old Testament view, every Israelite was the *chaber* of his neighbour, but the Pharisee would only recognize as such the man who scrupulously observed the law. This use of language resembles that of the pietists in modern Christianity. They call themselves by the simple name of "Christians." Others, no doubt, have a certain kind of Christianity. But they, and they alone, are the proper Christians. Similarly, the Pharisee only recognized the Pharisee as *Chaber*, as a brother of the covenant in the fullest sense of the term. All others¹ were "people of the land" (vv. 470–471).

To turn now to some of the minor points, upon which the present edition indicates a reconsideration of previous opinion, or an amplification of results hitherto held on less adequate grounds, we observe, e.g., that the note 147 on p. 35 of the Eng. tr. (vol. i.) is now expanded into a

¹ In his latest essay Friedländer, the Jewish scholar, vigorously defends the character of the Am-ha-aretz, protesting that they were really the pious, simple people, closely identified with the apocalyptic circles, who formed the healthy antipodes to the scribes and Pharisees.
closely-knit résumé of the arguments and evidence put forward last year by the author in Preuschen’s *Zeitschrift für die neueste Wissenschaft* (1906, 51–68), in order to prove that the θύρα τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἡ λεγομένη ὑραία (Acts iii. 2 = ὑ ὑραὶα πύλην, iii. 10) was the door at the eastern exit of the inner (or women’s) court of the temple, which the Mishna calls “the door of Nicano‘r.”

In the expanded note on συναγωγή (504–505, Eng. tr. i. 58–59), a parallel to the ideal sense of ἐκκλησία as opposed to συναγωγή is still sought in the supposed fact that qāhāl possessed a similarly high significance, although it has been repeatedly questioned (as e.g. by Hort, *Christian Ecclesia*, p. 15) whether the four proof-passages from the Talmud are sufficient evidence. On the meaning of συναγωγή, however (p. 518, E. tr. ii. 69), Schürer handsomely retracts his previous verdict. As he now admits, it is impossible to regard the term as equivalent to προσευκτήριον or σαββατεῖον. It denotes “gathering,” not “place of gathering.” The extension of the use of συναγωγή to buildings originated in Palestine, and was not current in the diaspora until after the rise of Christianity, when it rivalled the older term προσευχή (cf. Acts xvi. 13, 16), which had been applied to the buildings for three centuries, as the Egyptian inscriptions prove. Acts, by employing συναγωγή in this sense for the diaspora (xiii. 5, etc.), seems to follow the Palestinian usage.

Another rather important change of view is presented on page 428 (cf. Eng. tr. i. 362–363) in connexion with Hillel’s famous financial innovation of the προσβολή or registered declaration, which a creditor was permitted to make in court in order to secure payment of his money even during a Sabbatical year of legal release from all debts. Hitherto Schürer had explained the term from the opening words of the declaration (“I deliver to you”). But the linguistic
difficulty is serious, and he now accepts a suggestion made by Wilcken that the term is equivalent to the Latin juristic word *adjectio*, in the sense of "clause, or addition," the προσβολή or reservation of one's rights being an explanatory addition to the formal declaration. This seems very plausible; in default of a better theory, it may stand meantime.

On the Sadducees (pp. 475 f.), the estimate remains unaffected by Hölscher's brilliant attempt (*Der Sadduzäismus*, 1906) to discredit all the traditions which associate this party with the high priesthood. This involves, for one thing, as Schürer implies, far too radical and arbitrary a treatment of the literary sources, and, on the other hand, it does not satisfy the historical presuppositions of the post-Maccabean period.

The subsequent section (§ 27) on the school and the synagogue, one of the most instructive and fresh in the entire volume, has been brought up to date with especial care. Thus, on pp. 499–500 we find that a long note is inserted (Eng. tr. ii. 54) giving the evidence for synagogues in the Egyptian diaspora as far back as the third century B.C. Dr. Schürer, by the way, takes the phrase נין נא (Ps. lxxiv. 8), with most commentators, as an allusion to the synagogues, but there is a good case for the interpretation, recently favoured by Professor Kirkpatrick and Dr. Briggs, that the allusion is to feasts or festivals.

At the close of § 27(Eng. tr. ii. 88), some account is added of the Genisa form (published by Schechter in 1898) of the Schmone-Esre. This shorter and more original Cairo version has 18 instead of 19 blessings, the 14th and 15th being combined in one. Its form of the 12th blessing shows that the Christians were really mentioned in this synagogal prayer, as Justin, Jerome, and Epiphanius allege. One sentence of the petition in question runs: "And may the Nozrim (i.e. Jewish Christians or Nazarenes) and Minim (i.e. heretics
or apostates in general) . . . be blotted out of the book of life." It adds singular point to the words of Paul (Phil. iv. 3) and the prophet John (Apoc. iii. 5), when we recollect that such a prayer was rising constantly from the lips of the rigid Jews in worship. Schürer incidentally agrees with M. Friedländer for once, that the identification of the Minim with Jewish Christians (favoured recently by Mr. Herford) is untenable.

As might be expected, the immense amount of recent discussion upon the messianic problem has led to many improvements and alterations in section 29 (pp. 579 f.). Thus Schürer's present view of the messianic hope in Ecclesiasticus (pp. 590 f.) contrasts vividly with his former statement (Eng. tr. ii. 138). The expectation of a personal messianic king falls into the background, in this book; and "if the writer looked for such a king, on the basis of prophetic prediction, his anticipation sprang from the study of Scripture rather than from a living religious need." Far closer to his heart than any revival of the Davidic house was the perpetuity of the high priesthood in the house of Phinehas. The allusions to a Davidic régime in xlvii. 11 and 22 are set aside as too uncertain, while the Hebrew text of li. 12 is pronounced a loan from the Schmone-Esre, which really expresses the hopes of a Davidic restoration cherished after the catastrophe of 70 A.D. "One cardinal point," Schürer goes on to observe, "in which the religious life of the older apocryphal books, like Sirach, Judith, Tobit, and First Maccabees is differentiated from the messianic hope of the later period, is its lack of the resurrection hope. The writings just mentioned occupy, in this aspect, the position of ancient Israel's outlook: the dead lead but a shadowy life in Sheol, and beyond the present there is no future life of bliss. The resurrection hope, attested by the book of Daniel, evidently did not succeed in becoming a common possession during the second century B.C.; into certain circles
(among the Sadducees) it failed to penetrate at all” (pp. 593-594). In a brief paragraph, with a note upon the relevant literature, at the close of part ii. (pp. 608 f.; Eng. tr. ii. p. 154), the author declines to dogmatize upon the messianic ideas of the Samaritans, owing to the lateness of the sources.

Among other additions in the following section (iii.) may be noted a paragraph (613-614, added to Eng. tr. ii. 159) upon the term ηλειμμένος, which the Greek-speaking Jews of the second century adopted from Aquila as a substitute for Χριστός—the latter term having been appropriated by the Christians. Schürer also (p. 615) ranks himself among those who have refused to follow Lietzmann and Wellhausen in denying that “the Son of Man” is used as a name or title in Enoch. Strictly speaking, he notes, we must admit this. But as lxii. 7 and lxix. 27 show, the term is equivalent to a designation, and is fairly on the way to become a title. Again, on pp. 634-5, Schürer interpolates (after note 66 on p. 175 of the Eng. tr. vol. ii.) a paragraph to the effect that “Life in the messianic kingdom is represented as a condition of the most absolute bliss for which man can hope. No higher state is possible. The good things of heaven have come down to earth. Earth itself has become a part of heaven.” Then he adds in a footnote: “This idea, which in itself is correct, has been emphasized in too sharp and one-sided a fashion by Baldensperger in his Die messianisch-apokalyptischen Hoffnungen des Judentums (1903), pp. 150-158. He tries even to show that, among several circles at least, the messianic kingdom was conceived as a kingdom in heaven, referring specially to the passage in Assumpt. Mos. x. But this passage stands by itself. Elsewhere indeed we do find the expectation of bliss for the individual in heaven side by side with the expectation of a messianic kingdom, but we must not combine the two and
argue that the messianic kingdom was to be in heaven. As is clear from the descent of Jerusalem and the gathering of the scattered Israelites in the holy land, that kingdom, despite all its heavenly character, was a kingdom upon earth, though we must admit, of course, that the distinction between heaven and earth vanishes at this point for the religious feeling—at least, that is to say, wherever the messianic kingdom forms the final and supreme object of human hope.” Frequently this was not the case. The messianic reign was sometimes regarded as the prelude to a further and ultimate era of bliss, as in the apocalypse of Baruch and Fourth Esdras.¹

The few pages upon the conception of the suffering Messiah (pp. 648–651) give a useful résumé of the prevalent opinion on this dogma. As Schürer rightly argues, it was far from being dominant in the Judaism of the period. It was scholastic rather than popular. The allusions in Matthew xvi. 22, etc., are enough to show the difficulty found by ordinary Jews in grasping the connexion between the Messiah and any atoning significance in his sufferings and death.

The closing section, on the Essenes (§ 30), has been enlarged by a careful running survey of the recent literature which has been lavished on this enigmatic sect. To the bibliography may be added, however, two French studies by Stapfer (Revue de Théol. et Phil., 1902, 385–398) and P. Chapuis (“L’influence de l’essénisme sur les origines chrétiennes,” Revue de Théol. et Phil., 1903, 193–228). Schürer still hesitates about committing himself to the hypothesis of Pythagorean influence. Like Professor Cheyne, he is evidently reluctant to wear Zeller’s colours in his casque. The special features common to the Essenes and the Pytha-

¹ This footnote ought to have been inserted in the text, in order to make the connexion clearer.
goreans were Oriental, he is content to remark, and some allowance must be made at any rate for Zoroastrian tendencies.

In a final note (p. 680) he refers to a portion of the forthcoming volume of the Geschichte for a notice of the Therapeutae, but plainly remains impenitent upon the authenticity of the de vita contemplativa. Mr. Conybeare's demonstration of its Philonic authorship does not seem to have convinced him.

JAMES MOFFATT.

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS.

III.

THE GOSPEL NARRATIVES AND CRITICAL SOLVENTS.

It was before stated that a change in the treatment of the evidence for the Resurrection is necessitated by the new and more stringent methods of criticism applied to the narratives of the Gospels, and especially by the theory, now the prevalent one, of the dependence of the first and third Gospels, in their narrative parts, on the second—that of St. Mark. It is desirable, before proceeding further, to give attention to these new critical methods and their results, in their bearings on the subject in hand. It is, of course, too much to ask, even if one had the competency for the task, that a full discussion of the Synoptical problem should precede all examination of the narratives of the Resurrection, or that the Johannine question should be exhaustively handled before one is entitled to adduce a testimony from the Fourth Gospel. On the other hand, it seems imperative that something should be said on the critical aspect of the subject—enough at least to indicate the writer's own position, and some of the grounds that