DR. MOFFATT ON THE LITERATURE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

XII. The "Semi-Pseudonymity" of First Peter.

We have hitherto left wholly out of count Dr. Moffatt's attitude to the First Epistle of Peter, an attitude which is so enigmatic and confusing as to defy definition or comprehension, and to evade all inferences. Nominally, he calls it with much hesitation the work of Peter: practically he assigns it in so great a degree to some one else, that we learn nothing from it about the personality of Peter. Hence it becomes possible for the author at once to make the Apostle the source from which emanated this great Epistle, and yet to maintain a few pages earlier in the same Chapter III., that the person whose name it bears is less known to us as a man than Papias or Hegesippus, to assert that after Paul "a mist lies over the early Church, which is hardly dissipated by the recognition of Luke as the author of the Third Gospel [1] and Acts, or of a John in Asia Minor, with whom some of the 'Johannine' writings may be connected," and to class the Epistle as first, and presumably as thoroughly characteristic, among "the pastorals and homilies . . . which are obviously sub-Pauline, which must have been composed during the last thirty years of the first century and the opening decades of the second, which can be approximately grouped and in some cases dated, but which elude any attempt to fix them down to a definite author."

What are we to make out of this tissue of contradictions?

[1] I find that I have unconsciously altered Dr. Moffatt's usage in regard to capitals in many cases. He spells gospel, apostle, church, etc., always with small initial letters. I should have thought that the distinction between church, a mere building, and Church as the idea, was worth observing, and that the Gospel of Luke was as worthy of a capital as the Acts.

The obscurity only becomes more dense as we go more minutely into details. The "pastoral" called First Peter is classed among the works composed between A.D. 70 and say 120, first in the class, and yet on p. 339 Dr. Moffatt cannot induce himself to abandon "the traditional *terminus ad quem* of Peter's life," viz. A.D. 67. Now the difference between a date some short time before 67 and some (short) time after 70 is not a mere question of a few years up or down in a uniform period: it means the choice between two markedly different periods.

To take another example of the obscurity and (one almost says) self-contradiction, we find on p. 315 that "the traditions of the next century, such as they are, yield little or no data" to guide us regarding this class of Homilies and Pastorals, and "it is seldom certain whether such traditions are much more than imaginative deductions from the writings themselves." It is open to some critics to use this language about a class of documents in which First Peter is included; but Dr. Moffatt is barred out from it by his own admissions and opinions. "The Epistle," he says, "was familiar to Polycarp."[1] Polycarp died at the age of eighty-six in 155 or 156 A.D.[2]; and his testimony to the Epistle of "Peter, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, to the elect, etc.," is the evidence of one whose knowledge reached back

[1] Dr. Moffatt uses the spelling Polykarp, and has a strange preference for such anomalous and impossible forms as Illyrikum (p. 144) and Ikonium. It is allowable and right to prefer the Greek spelling Ikonion to the Latin form Iconium, but he must choose one of the two. Ikonium is a hybrid; Illyrikum is worse: the form Illyricum is Latin: Illyris is the proper Greek, used by Ptolemy, and Illyrikon is used only by writers dominated by the Latin form, such as Paul and Dio Cassius. This is pointed out, I think, in my *Histor. Commentary on Galatians*; but I am writing far from books, and cannot verify. Illyrikum is an outcast, rejected by gods and men. Polykarpos is a correct form; but Polykarp, though less unjustifiable than Ikonium, is not pleasing.

[2] There is evidence against the date 156 to use, disregarded by or unknown to the recent champions of that date.

into the first century. Professor Harnack is free to set aside this testimony as valueless, because he regards the introductory address as a spurious addition; but Dr. Moffatt disagrees with him, and after some slight hesitation pronounces the address original and genuine; and if that is so, then the testimony must rank as of the very highest character known in ancient literature. Dr. Moffatt must stand by his own opinions, and not hold them in one page only to reject them in another.

So also with the testimony of Papias, who "knew and used the Epistle" (p. 337). Why does Dr. Moffatt desert his favourite Papias here? Is it because the matter is certain in this case, whereas in regard to John's death the evidence of Papias, to which he attaches such value, depends on the ingenious combination of two uncertain references in two absolutely worthless late writers, who stand convicted of other errors in the same sentences in which they mention Papias? It is a curious fact about some scholarly minds, which I have observed and commented on many years before the name of Dr. Moffatt was known to the world, that they sometimes tend to value evidence not in proportion to its real weight, but in proportion to the ingenuity required to obtain or manufacture it. Where we know Papias on the indisputable authority of Eusebius Dr. Moffatt passes him lightly by. Where we know him only on the strength of uncertain interpretation and comparison of obscure words, used by George the Sinful and a late Epitomizer to support the opposite opinion, Dr. Moffatt regards him with the highest respect.

One might go on citing cases in the section on First Peter where the supposition rejected on one page is used as an argument in another; but it is needless to continue such ploughing of the sand. The method of the Section is misleading; the reasoning is involved and not unified, and the

only cause which I can see is that Dr. Moffatt does not like the conclusion to which he is driven, viz. that the "Petrine origin . . . probably will carry the day" (p. 344). This slight, so to say, subconscious dislike appears in such an expression as that on pp. 333–4: "this or almost any form of the pseudonym-hypothesis is legitimate and indeed deserving of serious consideration in view of the enigmatic data of the writing." This is a noteworthy sentence. For my own part I should venture to regard the problem of First Peter as among the simplest in character, the least complicated by varying shades in the "data," the most distinct and certain as regards result, of all the questions regarding the books of the New Testament; and to an unusual degree "the evidence for the existence and authority of the Epistle in the Church," as Dr. Moffatt says, "is both ample and early." Here, if anywhere, the pseudonym-hypothesis is extravagant, unjustifiable, the issue of an unregulated judgment which fails to distinguish between the probable, the improbable, and the impossible, seeing them all on much the same plane.

Hence Dr. Moffatt, so far as he reaches a conclusion, puts it as follows in the least indefinite and most personal expression of opinion that I can find, "This may stamp the Epistle, if one choose to say so, as semi-pseudonymous" (p. 333)—a quaint and yet characteristic statement, which can be used by the Author to support almost any train of reasoning, but which we cannot use without finding ourselves—whatever line we take—in contradiction with something which the Author says on some page or other of his discussion about Peter.

He says that "the dominant note of the Epistle is hope, but it would be unsafe to argue from the tone of a practical Epistle . . . to the character of the writer, or as if the virtue of hope was specially prominent in his personality." Yet

in the next paragraph he goes on to say that "a writing like this reveals a man's personality in several aspects, and one of these aspects is a warm, hopeful spirit" (p. 321). How can it be right to see in the Epistle the revelation of a warm hopeful spirit, and yet to caution the reader against inferring that hope was prominent in the writer's personality? What are we to make of this?

Vain every mesh this Proteus to enthral.

I feel inclined to hazard the conjecture that Dr. Moffatt wrote the former paragraph under the influence of a critic who was enforcing the sound principle that a letter-writer often laid stress on some topic, not because it was specially characteristic of his own nature, but because it was what his correspondents most needed and lacked; and that he wrote the second paragraph under the influence of another critic who practised more the equally sound method of using a letter as an indication of character. It requires judgment, sound sense, and above all a firm grasp of the personality of the letter-writer, to know when to use one and when the other of two equally sound principles. You cannot attain to a healthy and guiding criticism without exercising common sense. Now in this case Dr. Moffatt on his own showing and declaration lacks one of the needed elements in sound consistent criticism: he has never got hold of the personality of Peter, who is to him little more than a name, or rather a "semi-pseudonym." Without that firm grasp it is vain to criticise literature, for the criticism must become like "autumn trees without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots, clouds without water carried along by winds"—*unerquicklich wie der Nebelwind.*

I must not, however, pass from this subject without adding that there are many interesting and useful remarks about the character and spirit of the Epistle, and that here and elsewhere Dr. Moffatt often shows his remarkable power

of introducing apt and pertinent quotations from many writers. He has read so much and so carefully that his best paragraphs approximate to a cento of good things quoted from a vast variety of sources.

The great danger of this method of collection and comparison of various opinions of modern scholars is that it tends to produce among those who are not so learned as Dr. Moffatt the impression that this is right method of study, and that by classifying modern opinion one can arrive at a sort of resultant of right opinion. We have a Resultant Greek Testament, which gives a text based on that method, but in that line of study the method is not so misleading, though equally unscientific: the text of the Greek Testament has to be determined by a comparison and classification of written authorities; but a work like that of Dr. Moffatt is largely a sorting out of the rubbish heap of criticism, a classification of the residuum of useful remarks and suggestions after all the vast mass of useless statements has been rejected. By this method, however, what is kept is not a residuum of true statements, but a residuum of statements possessing sufficient ingenuity or plausibility to conceal their essential falsity and unscientific character. Moreover, the method ignores a fundamental factor, essential to right judgment in this matter. Those remarks and suggestions are repeated here apart from their context, whereas they originally formed parts of a wider theory, which in most cases even Dr. Moffatt rejects, and they first came into existence as the application of that theory, which has now few or no believers. The treatises from which they are quoted were each of them the logical carrying out of an idea which, generally speaking, has since been weighed and found wanting; and they all partake of the falsity of the general idea out of which they arise.

The mass of erudition and of quotations from or references to modern scholars and their opinions is enormous, and bears ample witness to the work and care expended on this book by the author. On p. 73, at which the book happens to open, I find fourteen quotations from or allusion to modern critics, and an "etcetera" following one list of five names. I have not verified any of the references to modern scholars, but accept them as correct.

XIII. Analogies from Classical Non-Christian Literature.

An interesting and really important feature of Dr. Moffatt's book is the large number of analogies quoted from the history of classical literature. As the only reference which has been made in the present review to this feature of the book gives a not very favourable example, I feel bound to say that the Author's examples are often good and useful, and that sometimes, in a spirit of perfect fairness, Dr. Moffatt quotes them even though they do not tell in favour of his own view. Their number shows how widely he has cast his net in preparation for the book that lies before us. We may profitably look for a little into this whole subject.

Some modern scholars have found that certain difficulties and apparent or real inconsistencies in the New Testament books discredit their trustworthiness and historical authority. If, however, we compare these books with the best classical literature, we shall be struck with the much more numerous difficulties in the latter than in the former. There is hardly an ancient writer of the highest class who is not full of unsolved problems in interpretation and text.

Next as regards accuracy of record, it seems worth while to add an example taken from the literature of the preceding century, a strictly contemporary registration of events by an actor taking a prominent part in the action

that he alludes to. I refer to Cicero, whose letters are the best authority for his time and an authority unsurpassed in any period, and who is a witness of the highest education and the most perfect honesty. Do we find in him a total absence of the difficulties and the slight superficial inconsistencies, which occur in the New Testament, and from which such sweeping inferences have been drawn?

In the year 51 B.C. Cicero travelled across Asia Minor from Laodiceia to Iconium. We have many of his letters written during the journey, or during the next two or three months, describing it. Yet it is an unsolved problem, after many attempts, to fix the exact rate and stages of his journey. The latest attempt known to me, and the most pretentious, that of O. E. Schmidt in his *Briefwechsel des M. Tullius Cicero*, Leipzig, 1893, p. 77 f., is the worst and most extraordinarily inaccurate of all. Though he estimates the distances from city to city very much according to the freedom of his own will, yet he makes the rate of Cicero's travelling vary very widely: the 126 miles from Philomelium to Iconium [1] he supposes to have been traversed in three days, an average of forty-two miles a day, by a man fifty-five years of age, used to a sedentary life in the city. No traveller, who knows by practical experience what travel in that country is like, will admit that Cicero travelled at such a rate with his train. Schmidt himself elsewhere states that thirty miles was his ordinary day's journey.

In spite, therefore, of the number and minuteness of the references and statistics and descriptions that Cicero gives of this short journey, his words have proved unintelligible to generations of scholars, and have given rise to quite

[1] This is the only one of Schmidt's estimates of distance which is near the truth. He gives Kiepert's map as his authority; but he must have used a very early edition of Kiepert.

extraordinary misapprehensions, to which I find no parallel in the New Testament. My own theory of the stages and distances varies greatly from Schmidt's: I think Cicero travelled at the rate of about twenty-five Roman miles per day, and I date his arrival in Iconium very differently. Yet we both found on the same ancient words used by one author about his own journey, and the words were all written while he was in Asia Minor, and some while he was on the road between Laodiceia and Iconium.

Moreover, Cicero contradicts himself repeatedly in his statements about this journey. In one place he says that he stayed 2 days at Laodiceia, 5 days at Apameia, 3 days at Synnada, 5 days at Philomelium.[1] In another place the numbers are 2, 4, 3, 3.[2] In a third they are 3, 3, 3.[3] These cannot be reconciled with one another; theories, on which we need not enter, may be devised to explain the differences in part; but even these must assume that Cicero wrote about such a simple matter from widely different points of view[4] at intervals of a few weeks.

Now, if such differences, or anything approaching them in extent, occurred even between different writers in the New Testament, what inferences would have been drawn according to the methods of reasoning fashionable among many modern scholars! This may be left to the reader's imagination.

Nor is it only about the events of the immediate past that Cicero differs from himself. He varies also about his plans for the future. During a residence in Laodiceia some months later, he wrote to his friend Atticus twice saying that about or after 15 May he intended to start for Cilicia;

[1] *Ep. ad Att.* v. 20. [2] *Ep. ad Fam.* xv. 4.

[3] *Ep. ad Att.* v. 16: this was written before he reached Philomelium. and therefore the length of stay there is not given.

[4] The attempt to attain uniformity in the evidence by alteration of the text is absolutely barred by the evidence and conditions.

but to another friend he wrote: "I think of starting for Cilicia about the first of May." [1] In yet two other places he says he is going to start on 7 May. It has been argued that Paul, after he stated in Acts xx. 25 his intention of not returning to visit his Churches in the Ægean lands, could not possibly have altered his plans in subsequent years; and serious inferences have been drawn from this. The same writers who insist that Paul could not have altered his intentions in that case must also argue that nothing but death could have prevented him from executing his declared intention of visiting Spain (Romans xv. 23). When he speaks of his intention he confirms Luke's report in Acts xx. 25 as to his feeling that the Ægean lands were now too narrow for his work. Cicero, however, could change his intention within a few days.

XIV.—The Unity of the New Testament.

On p. 9 Dr. Moffatt has some very just reflections of a general character on the method of studying the canon of the New Testament and its growth. He speaks of the danger which may arise from the treating the writings of the New Testament apart from the rest of "the literature of primitive Christianity." The canon "represents a dogmatic selection from" that literature. "Is there not a danger," he asks, "of isolating the writings unhistorically under the influence of what was the postulate of a later generation?"

Here it appears that Dr. Moffatt is on his guard against the danger, which after all he has not escaped, of examining the writings of the New Testament too much from the point of view of the later age. He here warns us against what elsewhere he in practice observes as right method.

[1] *Ep. ad Att.* v. 21, vi. 1 (15 May); *Ep. ad Fam.* xiii. 57 (about 1 May;) *Att.* vi. 2, *Fam.* ii. 13 (7 May). No editor has wantonly altered the text in order to secure uniformity.

In an early section of the present article we quoted from p. 8 his principle that one should select the later second century as giving the proper *coup d'œil* for studying the New Testament; and we have stated the opinion (1) that he carries out this principle in such a way and to such an extent as seriously to distort his view, (2) that it is a false principle. Now we see that on p. 9 he states a different and better principle; and this is far from being the only case in which he varies from himself in successive paragraphs or successive pages.

Thus on p. 9 the Author proceeds rightly to guard against a possible but wrong inference from the words which we have just quoted, viz., that "the unity of the New Testament is a purely factitious characteristic imposed upon its contents by the ecclesiastical interests of a subsequent age." In corroboration of this caution he aptly cites Dr. Denney, *Death of Christ*, pp. 1–4, and Dr. Sanday in Hastings' *Encyclop. of Religion*, ii. p. 576 f. He then quotes at length the opinion of a distinguished German scholar [1] that the canon of the New Testament includes all that was *upon the whole* of most value, oldest and most important in the literature of the early period. He protests, however, "against introducing *a priori* conceptions of unity and uniqueness into the historical criticism of the religious ideas and the literary form of the New Testament writings." All this is quite right and well said—said almost wholly in the words of others. There is a unity in the New Testament, but we must not hastily and without proper study form an *a priori* conception of what that unity is.

Yet in spite of this protest the only unity of which Dr. Moffatt takes any account in the New Testament is an *a priori* conception, viz., that which springs out of "the growing consciousness of the Church"; and he makes

[1] Wrede, *ueber Aufgabe und Methode etc.*, p. 11.

frequent and fatal use of this misinterpreted "consciousness." It supplies a convenient pseudo-explanation of almost all the most noteworthy phenomena; and it always implies an importation by the Church into the original and true history of ideas and pseudo-facts which were not contained there at first.

The Author's idea of the unity seems to be that it was imposed by the Church in order to make the New Testament what it now is; and he takes no account, so far as I have observed, of the real unity. One can and should, as he rightly holds, study each document apart and for itself, and one can and should also study the unity which he too finds running through the whole; but this unity is in his estimation not an internal unity springing from the natural development of the original idea and the original truth, an idea present in the historical facts from the beginning and gradually becoming clear to the great apostles as they lived and grew wise: it is an idea which grew through the invention or exaggeration of tales and the concoction of unhistorical legends about the Founder of the Church, and found in this process the means of expressing itself.

The order in which the Author studies the books of the New Testament is on the whole right, as appears to us, though in details we differ much from him. To us, as to him, the New Testament begins from Paul and ends with John; but we place First Peter later, and Hebrews with Ephesians decidedly earlier than he does. His action in taking away Ephesians from Paul causes a loss; but this, though a serious, yet is not a fatal loss: because Paul still remains, the one man whom Dr. Moffatt leaves to us in the New Testament: all the other great personalities, as he says himself, disappear, because their presentation to us in the documents is unhistorical and unreal, a figment of the "growing consciousness of the Church." The mis-

placement of Hebrews after First Peter seems to cause almost a more serious loss than the taking away of Ephesians, because it distorts the perspective of a period. Still, so far as order goes, the main lines of study which the Author follows are profitable: and no man can as yet prove his own opinion about chronology and order in the New Testament to the satisfaction of other scholars.

It is only when we approach the unifying principle which runs through the whole series of books that I have to part company absolutely from Dr. Moffatt. Each of us recognises the existence of such a unity; but the principle seems to me to lie in the progress towards more perfect recognition by the young and growing Church of the real nature and character and mission of Jesus, whereas to Dr. Moffatt it lies in the imposing on a real and very simple Jesus of an unreal and unhistorical nature and character and acts and words, and, above all, miracles.

There we are at the real *crux* of the whole matter. Often the disciples, as is several times said in the Gospels, did not at the time recognise the real meaning of Jesus' words. Later, as they looked back over the past, they were aware of their own blindness. The progress lay in their own minds: to Dr. Moffatt that implies that they put into their memory of Jesus' words something that was not originally there, something that came from their "growing consciousness": to me it implies that the disciples were growing in power of thought and in width or depth of mind, so that they were able to understand sayings which had previously been far too great for their simple nature to comprehend. The meaning and the vast sweep of thought and the wide outlook over the world and the penetrating insight into the nature of man and his relation to God and to the world were in the words from the beginning.

Take any of the great sayings of Jesus from almost any

page of the Gospels. How perfect they are, how complete in their comprehension of man and of God. There is nothing more left to say; all that remains to do is to understand the deep wisdom of those matchless and final statements: "Render unto Cæsar what is Cæsar's, and to God what is God's"—"The Son of Man is lord also of the Sabbath"—and so on. Yet they are so simple in expression that one is easily led to overlook their greatness. They overturn and renovate the whole view-point of His contemporaries. They take side with none of the parties or schools. They remake the world. They put an end to the old. They begin the new. From them history and thought take a fresh start. They are the supreme concentration of wisdom expressed in words that a child can understand in part, but of which human thought can never exhaust and fully comprehend the scope.[1]

As has been said above, the New Testament begins with Paul and culminates with John. One is thankful to see that Dr. Moffatt has no sympathy with the old misjudgment of Paul's knowledge of Greek and his incapacity for expressing himself in Greek. It is one of the curiosities and absurdities of all literature that one of the greatest masters of Greek, the man who adapted Greek to the expression of a new ethic and a new religion—not in an artificial jargon of technical terms, but in the language of the world—should have been described by so many modern scholars as unable to write Greek and as uneducated in Greek. Paul was fully conscious of the task that lay before him, viz., to express to the Greek-speaking world the *Sophia* of God, the wisdom or philosophy that is Divine, in other words the Christ who is the *Sophia* of God (1 Corinthians i. 24, 30).

[1] I may venture to refer to a paragraph in an essay on "The Charm of Paul" in my *Pauline and other Studies*, where something like this is said.

He had not merely to destroy a false *Sophia* (and that very purpose of destroying it sprang from his knowledge of its insufficiency and hollowness), but to explain the true *Sophia*. He knew that he was the philosophic architect (σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων), who had to lay the foundation on which others should build (1 Cor. iii. 10). Among the mature he expounded the Divine system of the true philosophy, the deep-lying scheme in which the Will of God has expressed itself; and he expounded it as a mystery, a secret truth now made plain to all (1 Cor. ii. 6, 13). He took such words as σωτηρία and εὐσέβεια, "Salvation" and "Godliness," [1] from the mouth of the pagans and put in them a new spiritual meaning. All men around him in Tarsus and in Ephesus were making vows and prayers for Salvation; and we can now still read the record of their desires on hundreds of inscribed stones; but they had never dreamed of the spiritual kind of Salvation which Paul explained to them, nor felt their need of it. It was the mission of Jesus at once to put into the hearts of men the sense of need for this Salvation, and to satisfy their need. It was the mission of Paul to make them understand the message of Jesus; and it was his Hellenic education and his understanding of the Greek nature and his power over the Greek language that fitted him for his mission, and marked him out as the Apostle of the Graeco-Roman world.

On Paul's power of expression Dr. Moffatt has some

[1] εὐσέβεια appears only in the Pastoral Epistles, and that has been unscientifically made a charge against their authenticity, as if "Godliness" were an un-Pauline idea. Considering how Paul had seen into the pagan heart, and how he understood the pagan nature, it would be to me an extraordinary thing if he had never explained to the men of his own age the true nature of that "Godliness" which was in their eyes so important. Paul had often explained its nature in speech. By chance it does not come up in any of his earlier letters; but that does not prove either that he was ignorant of the idea, or that he considered it unimportant.

good things. On p. 57 he says that "more than once in Paul it becomes an open question whether he is quoting from an early Christian hymn, or developing half-unconsciously the antitheses of his glowing thought: a good case in point is furnished by 1 Cor. xv. 42–43. Elsewhere, however, the genuine rhetoric of the speaker is felt through the written words; they show unpremeditated art of the highest quality, as, e.g., in passages like the hymn to love (1 Cor. xiii.), or the great apostrophe and exulting paean of Romans viii. 31 f." In this only the word "rhetoric" jars on me, and makes me uncertain whether Dr. Moffatt has felt the quality of Paul, or is merely under the influence of other writers: I can hardly imagine that one who had ever experienced the spell of Paul could use the word rhetoric about the two examples which he mentions from First Corinthians and Romans. He goes on to quote from Norden that "in such passages the diction of the Apostle rises to the height of Plato in the *Phaedrus*"; and he refers to Wilamowitz, who with true insight calls Paul "a classic of Hellenism." [1]

All that is in John is already implicit in Paul; but what lies in the letters of Paul becomes explicit and definite in the Fourth Gospel. John in his Gospel stands and moves always on the plane towards which Paul is struggling, and which he attains in his greatest moods and moments. If we ask how it was that John finally attained, while Paul was only striving towards it with the whole powers of his nature, like a runner pressing onward to the goal and staking his whole energy on gaining the prize, the explanation lies in the Revelation and the circumstances in which it was beheld—I say "beheld" rather than "composed."

[1] Writing in Iconium far from books I cannot be certain that the passage which Dr. Moffatt alludes to is the one which contains this phrase; but I think that it is.

In that living death to which John was exposed, he was set free from the trammels of the merely human nature to such a degree as no man before or since.[1]

XV. Conclusion.

Dr. Moffatt's book, full of learning and ability as it is, seems to exemplify what I once described as "a deep-seated vice in the modern methods of (New Testament) scholarship. The student finds so much to learn that he rarely has time even to begin to know. It is inexorably required of him that he shall be familiar with the opinions of many teachers dead and living, and it is not sufficiently impressed on him that mere ability to set forth in fluent and polished language the thoughts of others is not real knowledge. He does not learn that learning must be thought out afresh by him from first principles, and tested in actual experience, before it becomes really his own. He must live his opinions before they become knowledge, and he is fortunate if he is not compelled prematurely to express them too frequently and too publicly, so that they become hardened and fixed before he has had the opportunity of trying them and moulding them in real life." These sentences[2] sum up what this review attempts to say at greater length. Underneath the book which lies before us there is hidden a greater man than the Author shows himself in the printed page. He is, as I believe, capable of far better work if he once learns that we are no longer in the nineteenth century with its negations, but in the twentieth century with its growing power of insight and the power of belief that springs therefrom.

W. M. Ramsay.

[1] In my *Letters to the Seven Churches* I have attempted to explain this view at some length.

[2] Taken from "The Charm of Paul" in *Pauline and Other Studies.*

THE NEW MELANCHTHON LITERATURE.

DR. KARL SELL, in the book he wrote for the 400th anniversary of Melanchthon's birth in 1897, remarked that since 1883 the personality of Luther has been raised to a new life in Germany. "Such a resurrection," he added, "will not be granted to Melanchthon. He lives on in his work alone."[1] Dr. Sell was not a true prophet, for the past fourteen years have witnessed a remarkable output of Melanchthon literature, of which the greater part has a personal interest. In 1902 appeared the large volume of Georg Ellinger, a literary biography of the first rank, which, though not based on documentary research, supersedes for the general reader all previous "Lives" of the Reformer. The publications of the last three years alone suffice to show that the name of Philip Melanchthon is dear to the German people.

In 1861, when Carl Schmidt published his important biography, it may well have seemed that this particular field of research was covered, and that twenty-eight volumes of the *Corpus Reformatorum*, the last of which appeared in 1860, would be the final and all-sufficient monument to Melanchthon. It was recognized that the editors, Bretschneider and Bindseil, had rendered a service of inestimable value to Reformation scholarship. But all collections of this kind are necessarily incomplete, and the Melanchthon student of to-day dare not content himself with mastering even this extensive library. Its incompleteness was noted by Karl Hartfelder in 1889. "After occupying myself for many years with Melanchthon," he wrote, "I am firmly convinced that in the *Corpus Reformatorum* a considerable number of his writings (especially the smaller ones) are missing."[2]

[1] *Philipp Melanchthon und die deutsche Reformation bis* 1531, pp. 117, 118. [2] *Philipp Melanchthon als Praeceptor Germaniae*, p. ix.

Innumerable misreadings have been discovered, and so many of the letters have been transposed or wrongly dated that Dr. Bossert recently suggested the issue of a small volume rectifying the errors of Bretschneider in this respect alone.[1] Goethe's words become painfully true to the worker who at the beginning trusts confidingly to "C. R." :—

> Soll er auf die Felsen trauen?
> Selbst die festen Felsen beben.

It is the fashion with the new critics to comment severely on the errors of Bretschneider, some of which, it must be admitted, are apparent to the casual reader. Ought we not rather to be grateful for the indefatigable industry with which he collected those wonderful volumes of letters, the foundation of the entire modern Melanchthon literature? The time will doubtless come for a full revision of the *Corpus*, but the expense is for the time prohibitive. Another enterprise, less imposing in its general plan, yet so large as to require the co-operation of a group of eminent men, is now occupying the "Melanchthon Commission" of the Reformation Historical Society.[2] Under the general title, *Supplementa Melanchthoniana*, it is proposed to publish the writings of the Reformer which are not contained in C. R. The plan was first mooted in 1897, and an Imperial grant towards its prosecution was made in the following year. After preparatory labours, extending over a decade, the first large octavo volume, beautifully printed and produced, was issued in 1910, and the second followed in the spring of this year. In the preface to vol. i., which bears the signatures of Drs. Kawerau and Loofs, the hope is expressed that the work may now advance without any long interruption.

[1] *Theologische Literaturzeitung*. August 20, 1910. p. 530.

[2] The members of the Commission at present are: Drs. Adolf Harnack, Gustav Kawerau, Theodor Kolde, Max Lenz, F. Loofs and N. Müller. Dr. Drews will, for the future, take the place of Prof. Loofs. The volumes are published by Rudolf Haupt, of Leipzig.

There is a certain class of material—especially the numerous translations of Greek authors and the expositions of ancient writers—which has little historical importance for the present day, and the commissioners have wisely promised not to overload the *Supplementa* with reprints of this sort. The first volume, edited by Dr. Otto Clemen of Zwickau, is chiefly occupied with a German translation of the *Loci Communes*, made by Spalatin. Luther himself entertained for some time the idea of translating a work which he considered worthy of admission into the canon of Scripture, but he was hindered by pressure of business. In Spalatin's rendering, the *Loci* of 1521 and 1522 were spread far and wide among the German people, and exercised an incalculable influence in the progress of the Reformation. Dr. Clemen says: "The many editions, the translation into Low German, and the dispersion of the copies that still exist over all German-speaking countries, prove how eagerly desired and how extensively circulated this translation by Spalatin must once have been."

The second volume, edited by Dr. Zwicker, belongs to the philological department of the enterprise, and is entitled *Melanchthon's Dispositiones Rhetoricae*. Here we have many examples of his classwork for juniors, with stories and *obiter dicta* which throw light on the social and religious conditions of his time. His lectures, as Wilhelm Meyer has remarked, were full of agreeable chatter. His *Postilla*, or Sunday explanation of the Gospel of the day, is enriched with many anecdotes, many touches of quiet humour, and may still be read with enjoyment. In the new volume we have model letters, and short skeleton essays. The chapter headed "De apibus" is a charming addition to the letters in C. R. which show his interest in the habits of the bee. We note also his gifts as a story-teller. Æsop's short fable of the Wind and the Sun is expanded into a racy German

narrative covering two pages. Many of his students, it must be remembered, were lads between the ages of fourteen and seventeen, and for him it was a pleasure, as well as a duty, to bring his lectures within their compass. Harnack calls him the model German professor, and in other circumstances he would have been a model elementary schoolmaster. He wrote many letters of encouragement to village teachers, and when taking leave of his beloved Camerarius a few days before his death he said, "We have both been schoolmasters and faithful comrades, each in his own place, and I trust our labours have not been in vain, but have been profitable to many."

Under the form of class exercises, he gives advice on practical matters. No. cxv. is a warning against the habit of eating unripe fruit, and he tells of a promising student whose fatal illness was brought on by a surfeit of pears. He watched with fatherly care over every detail in the daily life of his boys.

The *Dispositiones Rhetoricae* are placed by the editor in the years 1552–53, and it is noteworthy that No. xxvi. is a clear argument against the infliction of capital punishment on heretics. Servetus was burned in 1553, and in the following year Melanchthon approved of his execution on the ground that he was a blasphemer. He must have done so with grave misgivings.[1] The labour spent on these first volumes of the *Supplementa* must be apparent to every reader. Dr. Zwicker, for example, has worked upon a manuscript which is the copy of notes actually taken in the classroom, so that Melanchthon's words here reach us at third hand. The editor has endeavoured to verify, as far as

[1] The "Epilogue" to No. xxvi. is as follows: "Itaque, cum dilectio tum mandatum dei piorumque exempla ostendant non licere haereticos interficere, abhorrendum est ab hac crudelitate, et parcendum illis, ut emendentur" (p. 19).

possible, every classical allusion. He has discovered a number of errors, for some of which the student may be responsible, and for others the professor. Sixteenth century scholars were seldom strictly accurate in their quotations from the classics, and Melanchthon, in preparing his illustrations, trusted largely to the inexhaustible stores of his memory, and did not always verify his references.

The 4,000 New Letters.

The heaviest burden of the undertaking rests on Professor Nikolaus Müller of Berlin, who is responsible for the editing of some 4,000 "new letters." To the efforts of Dr. Müller Melanchthon's birthplace owes the richly-furnished "Memorial House," whose green roofs may be seen from the train as we approach Bretten from Heidelberg. Himself a son of the Bavarian Palatinate, he visited Bretten for the first time in his student days, and brought away from this pilgrimage an earnest desire to honour the great teacher's memory. He had hoped, as he tells us,[1] to find at Bretten the actual birthplace, but he found only the uninteresting house erected on the site of that historic structure after the conflagration which destroyed almost the whole town in 1689.

We need not linger here on the practical side of Dr. Müller's lifework; on the courage with which, single-handed, he devised a noble monument for the quater-centenary of the Reformer's birth, or the patient zeal with which he collected the necessary funds, enlisting the aid of princes and scholars, gathering contributions from lands so remote as Iceland and South Africa. Every scarred and blackened stone that was saved from the fire at Bretten, every morsel of old painted glass that bears the arms of the Schwartzerdts, every scrap

[1] In the *Festschrift zur Feier der Einweihung des Melanchthon-Gedächtnishauses.* (Bretten, 1903.)

of fading parchment in the Rathaus, is as dear to him as the dust of Jerusalem was to the Hebrew saints. The entire Protestant world shares the gratitude felt by his own countrymen for Professor Müller.

It is not only as a builder that he has been active. In 1884, while working at Rome, he made his first independent researches into the life-story and literary remains of his hero. His contributions to the *Supplementa* will bring us the harvest of nearly a generation's toil among archives. He has been closely occupied with Wittenberg manuscripts of the sixteenth century, and has come to the conclusion "that the Wittenberg of the Reformation age is still in many respects a *terra incognita*." At the time of writing he has in the Press an important book dealing with Melanchthon's house in the Collegienstrasse. Three or four months ago he published a valuable collection of documents on the obscure subject of the Wittenberg agitations of 1521 and 1522.[1] In the Introduction he remarks that both the German and the Latin texts printed in C. R. are swarming with errors due to incorrect reading of the manuscripts. "The copies of the pieces which refer to the Wittenberg events of 1521 and 1522 were made under a peculiarly unlucky star. Such errors, for instance, as 'neun etc.' instead of 'crucifix' must be regarded as monstrous blunders. It must be added that the first editor of the *Corpus Reformatorum*, Bretschneider, is unfortunately not the only person who deserves blame. The letters and State papers published in later years contain many proofs that even in the most recent times there has been a lack of the necessary care."

A small work of rare personal interest is Professor Müller's recent edition of the reports of the Wittenberg professors

[1] *Die Wittenberger Bewegung* 1521 *und* 1522. . . *Briefe, Akten, u. dgl. und Personalien.* Leipzig, 1911. This book is revised and enlarged from articles in the *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte.*

on Melancththon's last illness and death.[1] The new Latin and German texts are much better than those in C. R., and the editor provides many notes, as well as careful biographies of the chief persons mentioned. Some of his minor discoveries are really curious. For example, he has found that in the years following Melanchthon's death, the fanatical zeal of Caspar Peucer and his associates actually caused Luther's hymns to be banished from the town church of Wittenberg.

No fresh fact is too trifling to be recorded by Dr. Müller. He has found a note of the quantity of oats consumed by the horse which was lent to Melanchthon by the Elector Frederick for his journey from Augsburg to Wittenberg in August, 1518. The young professor was three weeks on the road, as we see from the words: 8 scheffel, 1 mos, uf 1 pferd, 3 wuchenn, welches magister philippus der greck von awspurg alher gerittenn." Riding and dancing were two accomplishments which "the Greek" brought with him to the Saxon University.

Four thousand new letters! Is it possible to make any forecast of the contents of this promised treasure-store? From the publishers' advertisements and the general preface, only a few vague indications may be drawn. Dr. Bossert, himself an authority on Melanchthon, has pointed out that the first business of the Commission must be that of dealing with the correspondence, and he assigns to the editors a twofold task: (1) They will enlarge, at the earliest possible moment, the collection of letters already existing in C. R. by adding to it the more recent discoveries, especially those of Professor N. Müller. (2) They will revise those letters of Melanchthon already published which would have been printed afresh but for consider-

[1] *Philipp Melanchthons letzte Lebenstage, Heimgang und Bestattung.* Leipzig, 1910.

ations of expense. "The wrong addresses, the inaccurate readings of the text, and, above all, the mistaken dates of Bretschneider, must be rectified." [1]

In the new collection we may expect to find every letter written by Melanchthon which has appeared since 1860 in places difficult of access. There are many important letters, for instance, in Bindseil's volume published at Halle in 1874, but this is now out of print.[2] The letters to Ambrosius Blaurer are reprinted in the correspondence edited by Dr. Traugott Schiess.[3] It is to be hoped that the editor will be generous in providing us with full texts and not merely references, in such cases as C. Krause's collection, which throws light on Melanchthon's relations with the Princes of Anhalt.

Theological and historical magazines of the past forty years have, no doubt, been closely searched. The *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* provides interesting additions from the earliest volumes onwards. The July number of this review, which is published as we write, contains fresh material collected by Dr. Otto Clemen. Remembering the many letters now hidden away in old magazine volumes, the student can easily understand how this large new collection has grown and is growing.

We gather from the announcements that the 4,000 letters will scarcely include all the existing correspondence, not contained in C. R., which was addressed to Melanchthon, or which passed between other parties on matters in which he was concerned. If the plan of the Enders-Kawerau edition of Luther's letters were strictly followed the *Supplementa* might extend beyond all reasonable limits. The letters of Luther to Melanchthon, which are printed, accord-

[1] *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, August 20, 1910. P. 530.

[2] The writer has tried in vain for three years to obtain a copy of it.

[3] *Briefwechsel der Brüder Ambrosius und Thomas Blaurer.* (1908, Freiburg i. Br.)

ing to the best modern readings, in the Enders volumes, are not likely to be reproduced elsewhere, but we may assume that Professor Müller will give references to this and other easily accessible sources. Letters in more obscure places, such as Hartfelder's *Paedagogica*, will, we hope, be included in full. It is sad to think that Karl Hartfelder, who died at the age of forty-five, might, if a normal lifetime had been granted him, have worked side by side with the editors of the *Supplementa*. His grave, in an obscure part of the Heidelberg Cemetery, is marked to-day by a half-concealed, ivy-covered stone, which tells us nothing of his services to Reformation literature.

Coming now to the "discoveries" ("die neuen Funde") and setting aside the mass of new correspondence dealing with public matters, let us ask frankly, first, What do we want? and next, What is Dr. Müller likely to give us?

The most welcome of all additions to the correspondence would be letters written by Melanchthon to his own family at Bretten, especially during his early years at Wittenberg. He was passionately attached to his home, and named his brother George as the foremost of his friends. The boys had studied together at Bretten and Pforzheim, and George was a fellow-boarder with Philip in the Burse at Tübingen. To him, surely, Melanchthon must have sent his early impressions of Wittenberg. We have in C. R. many of his happy, confident letters to Spalatin, glowing with young enthusiasm, full of plans and promises—letters of which Reuchlin would have approved. Unfortunately, his home letters of these months have perished.

Dr. Müller published three years ago a learned *Life of Georg Schwartzerdt*.[1] In the preface he describes himself

[1] *Georg Schwartzerdt, der Bruder Melanchthons und Schultheiss in Bretten.* Leipzig, Rudolf Haupt, 1908.

as a "path-finder," because he has worked so largely with new materials. Yet even he was only able to supply four letters written by the Reformer to his brother, and these lie between 1540 and 1552. The following passage gives a clue to what we must *not* expect from the *Supplementa*—

"Correspondence was the principal means by which they [the brothers] maintained a permanent intercourse and interchange of thought. We must not indeed assume that letters from Wittenberg reached Bretten and letters from Bretten reached Wittenberg anything like once a week. Even if the two brothers had desired to keep up such an active correspondence, their plans would have been frustrated for want of sufficient opportunities of sending letters to each other. For the number of messengers who travelled between Wittenberg and the Electoral Palatinate was much smaller than that of those who went, for instance, between Wittenberg and Nürnberg. Moreover, as time passed on, the elder brother became more and more overburdened with work. He was often obliged to write ten or more letters on one day, and could only now and then spare time to write a little note to his home. As he mentions by chance in 1550, he, the overworked man, was able at that time to write to his dear brother only twice a year, and that was at the time when the merchants travelled to the fair at Frankfort-on-the-Main. Unfortunately, owing to Melanchthon's habit of destroying the letters he received, we cannot hope that any larger number of the writings sent to him from Bretten is lying somewhere, awaiting discovery. Schwartzerdt seems indeed to have carefully collected his brother's letters, but in consequence of the many storms of war which passed over South-west Germany, the precious treasure, with the exception of the few relics still preserved in St. Gallen, seems to have completely perished." [1]

[1] *Georg Schwartzerdt*, p. 37.

Elsewhere in the same book Dr. Müller says that his long-continued search for unpublished fragments of Melanchthon's correspondence has produced only miserable remnants ("kümmerliche Reste") of the letters that passed between him and his South-German relatives.

There are two letters, ostensibly written by Melanchthon to his brother in 1529 and 1530, which are obvious and clumsy forgeries. They were published more than a hundred years ago in Germany by J. F. W. Tischer, who said he had found them written at the end of an old Vulgate of 1543. Hartfelder took them from Tischer and published them in his *Paedagogica* (1892). He expressed no opinion as to their genuineness, merely asking in a note, "Where can the originals be now?" An American biographer, Dr. J. W. Richard, translates one of these letters from Hartfelder's book, without any apparent suspicion that it was never written by Melanchthon, though the reference to the Marburg Colloquy in the companion letter might have warned him. Professor Müller has made careful inquiry for the "originals," but the Vulgate of 1543 has not been traced.

Will the *Supplementa* enlarge our knowledge of the Reformer's home-life at Wittenberg? Any additional information of this kind would be thankfully received. As Ellinger has pointed out, we know comparatively little of Melanchthon as husband. "Family feeling in the sixteenth century," he says, "expressed itself not so much in the inner companionship of the wedded pair as in their relations to their children."

Luther's married life lies open to all the world. No woman of her generation stands forth more clearly than Katherine von Bora. We feel her presence and influence throughout the "Table Talk," and the last letters she received from her husband, with their gay, child-like humour

and deep underlying tenderness, are the best proofs that no shadow had ever fallen upon their love. We can scarcely imagine Luther without his Katie. "She has served me," he said, "not only as a wife, but as a maid." All the correspondence goes to prove that during his lifetime she was the first lady in Wittenberg.

Melanchthon, also, was happy in his home-life. His colleague and friend, Veit Oertel, thought he had never seen a man who loved wife, children, and grandchildren so dearly. Yet the careful student of C. R. is astonished by the rarity of affectionate references to his wife in Melanchthon's correspondence. His "enorme Schreibseligkeit" (to quote a phrase of Dr. Sell) did not lead him to send kindly messages from her to his friends. It is doubtful whether she entered at all into his public interests. She is mentioned, with rare exceptions, only at times of severe illness, and the coolness of his tone in more than one such crisis is surprising. The letters in which he refers to her with warm and tender love were written after her death in 1557. As far as the writer is aware, not a single direct communication that passed between husband and wife has been preserved. We have letters from Melanchthon to his son Philip, to his son-in-law Caspar Peucer and to his faithful servant and friend, John Koch, but a veil hangs over the inmost sanctuary of his household. Camerarius describes his friend's wife as *uxor viri amantissima*, and he praises her liberality to the poor, but his language has not the warmth of personal feeling. Caspar Cruciger, one of the closest friends of the family, used a Greek phrase about "female tyranny," which biographers understand as implying that Katherine Melanchthon used her influence at a time of strained relations with Luther, to prevent a frank discussion of differences between the two great men.

Melanchthon's marriage, as is well known, was not origin-

ally a love-match .He followed the advice of Luther, who had feared that his habits of overstudy and complete disregard of personal comfort would result in an early breakdown of health. Disagreeable incidents marked the weeks following the betrothal. Melanchthon's mother was so much displeased with her eldest son for taking a wife in Wittenberg that she herself entered on a third marriage, thereby implying that she had given up hope of his return to Bretten to be the comfort of her declining years. More annoying was the talk of slander-mongers in the Saxon "University village" which threw discredit on the past life of the young bride-elect. Luther mentions in one of his letters that the wedding was hastened for fear of evil tongues.[1] In his *Table Talk* he alludes more than once to the distress caused to Melanchthon by the lying gossip of the place. "The devil," he said, "is an enemy of the state of matrimony, and assails it through poisonous tongues."[2]

The words of Dr. Ernst Kroker may be cited: "We never once find that Luther, in his letters or his *Table Talk*, refers in cordial language to Melanchthon's wife, although he takes pleasure in greeting the wives of other friends with a jest or a few kindly words. Her husband, also, hardly ever adds greetings from her to his own letters. We never hear of her visiting the Augustinian monastery, though her children were the playfellows of Katie's children, and her husband was often Luther's supper-guest for weeks together. She seems, in fact, to have stood somewhat apart from that close bond of friendship which linked her house with Katie's house during all these years."[3]

[1] Enders, *Luther's Briefwechsel*, vol. ii. p. 524.

[2] Ernst Kroker, *Luther's Tischreden*, No. 737c, and see also No. 29, where the reference is certainly to the marriage of 1520, though the word "Tochter" has crept into the text by mistake.

[3] *Katharina von Bora* (1906), p. 199. The absence of greetings from his wife in Melanchthon's letters may be partly explained by his habit of

Is it too much to hope that Professor Müller, who is certainly keeping surprises in store for us, may discover a few letters written by Melanchthon to his wife and daughters during his frequent absences from Wittenberg? That such letters once existed there can be no doubt whatever.[1] Are they all melted like snowflakes into the "yeast of waves"?

As we await Dr. Müller's contributions, the thought suggests itself that perhaps some scholar of the twenty-first or twenty-second century may add yet more *Supplementa* to the correspondence of the Praeceptor Germaniae. We have not gathered yet the full harvest of these hours of silent sowing before the dawn. Is it not reasonable, under these circumstances, to make allowance for lost letters? Ludwig Geiger accused Melanchthon of ingratitude towards his second father, Reuchlin, because in the letters of 1522 there is no allusion to Reuchlin's death. Ought he not to have mentioned that the family letters of this year have all perished? Geiger ignores the fact that Reuchlin, in his timorous old age, refused to associate himself in the slightest degree with Luther's cause, and sent a message asking his grand-nephew to stop writing to him. It was not ingratitude, but good sense and delicacy of feeling, which forbade Melanchthon to publish a eulogium from Wittenberg immediately after the great man's death.

Even that most fair-minded of critics, Dr. Kawerau, was surprised to find no reference in Melanchthon's letters to the death of his old friend, Justus Jonas.[2] Where such omissions occur, may we not write on our mental tablets, "a lost letter," and give him the benefit of the doubt?

JANE T. STODDART.

writing in the dark of the early morning, long before the rest of the household were astir.

[1] Note, for instance, the reference to family letters in C. R., vol. iii. col. 1,062.

[2] *Der Briefwechsel des Justus Jonas, Zweite Hälfte*, p. lvii.