The title *The Romance of New Testament Scholarship* was chosen by the President of Drew University, Madison, N.J., when he invited the author to give a series of lectures before professors and students in the Divinity faculty in the autumn of 1947. As the terms of the foundation under which they were given required that the subject should be treated biographically, representative groups of scholars were considered in such a way as to show how our present study of the New Testament has been enriched by the researches of great men in former generations. To be ignorant of their achievements is to start with a false perspective in approaching the problems which confront the young student today. The biographical approach gives a rich human interest to the study of questions that might not prove so attractive by a severely academic treatment. Its purpose is to kindle an interest that will lead to sound and scholarly study of the New Testament.

THE ROMANCE OF NEW TESTAMENT SCHOLARSHIP

DREW LECTURESHIP IN BIOGRAPHY

The Drew Lectureship in Biography was established in 1928 *by President and Mrs. Ezra Squier Tipple, it being their desire to make accessible to the students of Drew Theological Seminary and the other students of Drew University an annual course of lectures in Christian Biography. Nine courses of lectures have already been given. These lectures, the tenth in the series, were given in* October 1947

THE ROMANCE OF NEW TESTAMENT SCHOLARSHIP

by

Wilbert Francis Howard

M.A. (Manchester), D.D. (London)
Hon. D.D. (St. Andrews and Manchester)

Principal of Handsworth Theological College
Birmingham

LONDON: THE EPWORTH PRESS

PUBLISHED BY
THE EPWORTH PRESS
(FRANK H. CUMBERS)
25-35 CITY ROAD, LONDON, E.C.1

*

New York . *Toronto*
Melbourne . *Cape Town*

*

FIRST PUBLISHED IN 1949

THIS BOOK IS PRODUCED
IN COMPLETE CONFORMITY WITH THE
AUTHORIZED ECONOMY STANDARDS

PRINTED AND BOUND IN ENGLAND BY
HAZELL WATSON & VINEY LTD
AYLESBURY AND LONDON

Preface

AT Christmas 1939 an invitation came from Dr. Arlo Ayres Brown, the President of Drew University, to deliver the Drew Lectures on Christian Biography under the lectureship founded by President and Mrs. Ezra Squier Tipple. The title suggested to me was 'The Romance of New Testament Scholarship', and the invitation arose because of an essay published in *Religion in Life*, dealing with the career of Sir William Ramsay. War delayed the delivery of these five lectures until the autumn of 1947. The terms of the foundation required that the form of the treatment should be biographical. The lectures dealt with five representative groups of scholars, who in various ways have done so much to quicken interest in New Testament studies, and to enrich our stores of biblical knowledge. If the first lecture may seem to carry the subject back into too remote a past, let it be remembered that the problems there discussed have reappeared from time to time and are pressing themselves upon our attention today. How entirely relevant to the present situation is the story of Marcion, to give one example, may be seen by reading Dr. Godfrey Phillips's recent book, *The Old Testament in the World Church* (Lutterworth Press, 1942).

By the courtesy of the Abingdon-Cokesbury Press and the Editor, Dr. Nolan B. Harmon, the essay,

'William Mitchell Ramsay, Archæologist and Historian', is appended to the five Drew Lectures.

Two personal words must be added. It was by the generous invitation of President Tipple that I spent a semester at Drew Theological Seminary as visiting lecturer on the New Testament in the early months of 1919. The memory of those happy months on the Drew campus gives an added pleasure to this association with the name of the founder of the Drew Lectures. The delightful week which my wife and I spent in the fall of 1947 at Drew as the guests of President and Mrs. Brown will be an abiding memory, not less for the gracious hospitality of our host and hostess and the kindness of their colleagues than for the beauty of Drew Forest in its autumnal glory.

For help in correcting the proofs my warmest thanks are due to my wife and my elder son, also to my colleague, the Rev. Philip S. Watson, M.A., who has done me the additional kindness of preparing the two indexes.

W. F. HOWARD

HANDSWORTH COLLEGE
BIRMINGHAM
August 1948

Contents

Acknowledgements

Acknowledgement is made to the following publishers for kind permission to quote from their books: Messrs. Ernest Benn Ltd. (*The Letters of Gertrude Bell*), The Syndics of the Cambridge University Press (*Lightfoot of Durham*, edited by G. R. Eden and F. C. Macdonald), Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton Ltd. (*Letters of Principal James Denney*), and Messrs. Macmillan & Co. Ltd. (*The Life and Letters of Fenton J. A. Hort*, by Sir Arthur F. Hort, and *The Accidents of an Antiquary's Life*, by D. G. Hogarth).

One

Pioneers in the Ancient Church

IF some devout Christian, living a generation after the events described in the four Gospels, had been granted a vision of the Church in the year 1947, many things would have amazed him. One of the most surprising would have been the fact that the book most widely circulated throughout the world was a Christian Bible, translated into every known tongue. The strangest thing of all would be the very existence of such a Bible. For he would discover to his astonishment that bound up with the scriptures of the Jews was a collection of Christian writings regarded as not only equal in sanctity with the sacred writings of the Jewish religion but superior to them, as giving the substance of what they dimly foreshadowed.

The story of the growth of the earliest Christian literature, of the separation of certain writings from all others to form the canon of the New Testament, of the copying and editing of the text of the Christian Scriptures, is a fascinating study. Much that we should like to know is lost beyond recovery. Who was the first to write down a collection of the sayings of Jesus? Who was the unnamed editor who first made a diligent search for any surviving letters written by the Apostle Paul, and then published his collection for the Church as a whole? Who were the authors of the apocryphal

gospels, when were they written, and what were those like of which we have but fragmentary remains? Can we be sure that the books contained in our New Testament are identical in content and form with the original autographs? Seeing that so much has perished that was written in the first century after Pentecost, how is it that we know as much as we do about that obscure period in the history of the Church?

In this lecture we shall think of four names which, for various reasons, stand out as landmarks in the second, third, and fourth centuries. The first is a heretic, the second a great biblical scholar, the third a great historian, the fourth a great translator. They are Marcion, Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome.

(1) It was in the first year of the Emperor Antoninus Pius (A.D. 139) that a stranger arrived in Rome and made himself known to the leaders of the Church in the imperial city. He was a wealthy shipowner named MARCION, who celebrated his reception into the local church with a gift of 200,000 sesterces (£17,000). His father was Bishop of Sinope in Pontus, on the southern shore of the Black Sea, who is said to have excommunicated his son, apparently for heresy. At that time such disciplinary action would be local in its effect, and as he was an earnest though eccentric Christian, Marcion would not be excluded from Church fellowship elsewhere, as he brought with him letters of commendation from some of the brethren. With the zeal of a missionary he first carried his peculiar presentation of Christianity to proconsular Asia, and asked for recognition by the leaders of the Church in

Ephesus, and possibly also in Smyrna and Hierapolis. They rejected his teaching, and it was probably at this stage of his career that Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, denounced him with the words: 'I recognize you as the first-born of Satan'. It was after this rebuff that Marcion went to Rome. Whether his generosity disposed the Romans to bear patiently with his novel teaching, or whether his previous experience had taught him caution, we cannot say. At any rate, he continued as an active member of the Church in Rome for five years, until the breach came in the year 144.

The cause of this rupture was no divergence on questions of ecclesiastical polity: it was theological. Marcion was reared in a Christian home, familiar with the Old Testament (the bible of the Primitive Church), and an enthusiastic disciple of the Apostle Paul. Everyone has heard Harnack's epigram, which Deissmann was so fond of quoting: 'In the second century there was only one Gentile Christian who understood Paul, and he misunderstood him.'[1] This refers to Marcion's exaggerated emphasis upon the Pauline contrast of Law and Gospel. Marcion regarded himself as an orthodox Christian. In the earlier stage of his teaching he borrowed one error from the Gnostics in holding that matter is inherently evil. But though this coloured his doctrine, his main concern was at first to bring out the contrast between the state of man according to the teaching of the Old Testament and the dispensation of grace which Jesus Christ brought

[1] Harnack, *History of Dogma* (E.T.), i, p. 89. For Marcion's career, see A. Harnack, *Marcion*, 2nd ed. (1924), pp. 21 ff.

down from heaven. He did not reject the Jewish scriptures as in themselves untrue. He was obsessed with the incompatibility of the teaching given by Jesus with that found in the Old Testament. God the Creator is just and reveals Himself in the reign of law. But justice is inflexible. The Gospel reveals God as kind, merciful, forgiving. Moreover, since matter is evil, the Creator cannot be the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. So Marcion was led to a dualistic theology which distinguished between the God of the Old Testament and the Stranger God, unknown except as He has made Himself known in His Son. This conclusion was embodied in his *Antitheses*, in which the contents of the Old Testament and of the Gospel were set forth in a series of oppositions: the Creator and the God of love, the Judge and the Redeemer, the Law bestowed upon one nation and the message of Salvation offered to all mankind. The result of this was to aver that the Gospel does not complete the Law, and Christ does not fulfil prophecy. Christianity displaces Judaism, and the Jewish scriptures are obsolete for the Church. The Gnostic repugnance for the material led to a Docetic view of Christ, for the Son of God could not actually assume a sinful body; His manhood was but a semblance.

Marcion's rejection of the Old Testament left Christianity without an authoritative standard. What was to take its place? He was ready with his answer. The Christian Scriptures are a twofold bible—Gospel and Apostle: the story of the revelation of the God of mercy in the life and teaching of Christ, and the

writings of the one faithful interpreter of Jesus, the Apostle Paul, who, unlike the first disciples, had alone discerned the essential message that mercy is greater than justice and that the Gospel abolishes the Law. Yet there were difficulties in discovering the authentic Gospel among the many records of the Saviour's life. So Marcion fastened upon that Gospel which bore the name of Luke, the friend and disciple of Paul. Certainly there were still obstacles to be overcome. The story of the birth and childhood of Jesus, His upbringing in His ancestral religion, His baptism by John—the last of the prophets of Judaism—would not fit into this new theological framework. So St. Luke's Gospel was edited with vigour and rigour, and the story opened with the sudden descent from heaven of Jesus in a synagogue at Capernaum. Ten of the Pauline letters, all but the letters to Timothy and Titus, formed the second part of the new sacred canon. Here again the amputative knife was necessarily applied, for Marcion was more Pauline than Paul. It is still an open question how far the text Marcion used was drawn from a form current in Rome in the early middle of the second century where that differs from a later revision with which we are more familiar. But Marcion's text as it has come down to us in the passages quoted by his critics and opponents shows clear evidence of tendentious abridgement and modification. Nevertheless, Marcion had made history. He had published the first canon of the New Testament.

Marcion now challenged the presbyters of the Church in Rome to declare their attitude to his work

and teaching. This led to a formal conference, which Marcion opened by asking the meaning of the sayings about the two trees (Luke 6^{43}) and about the patched garments and the new wine in old skins (Luke $5^{36 f.}$). The elders seem to have failed to give a satisfactory exegesis, but they saw that his teaching was not only revolutionary but destructive of the apostolic tradition. They rejected his new theology, returning to Marcion the munificent gift already referred to, and the heresiarch replied: 'I will tear your Church and make a rent in it for ever.' His boast was no empty threat, for Justin Martyr, writing a few years later, speaks of Marcion as 'still alive and teaching his disciples to believe in some other God greater than the Creator, and . . . has caused many of every nation to speak blasphemies'. Half a century later Tertullian wrote that Marcion's heresy had 'filled the whole world'. Marcion himself seems to have lived but a few years after his breach with the Church, and we are not concerned in these lectures with the history of the rival sect which he founded, and which flourished for several centuries and then suddenly faded and died.

The supreme importance of Marcion's name is in connexion with the canon and text of the New Testament. Challenged by his bold announcement of the new Christian canon, his opponents were moved to counteraction. The Church also issued a New Testament consisting of Gospel and Apostle. But the Gospel was a fourfold Gospel, 'according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John'. The sequel to the third Gospel was of course added, together with thirteen Pauline Epistles.

Within the present century an interesting discovery was brought to light by a Belgian scholar, the Benedictine Dom Donatian de Bruyne.[2] It had long been known that in a number of Old Latin MSS. of the Pauline Epistles there are prologues or prefatory statements about their authorship and place of origin. De Bruyne proved that these had been taken over bodily from the Marcionite prologues, but the order was altered and fresh prefaces were added to separate the two Thessalonian and two Corinthian Epistles and for the three Pastoral Epistles (which were absent from Marcion's canon). Later on a further discovery was made. In a large number of MSS. there are Latin prologues to Mark, Luke, and John, and two MSS. have the Lucan prologue in its Greek original. De Bruyne[3] has proved that these were anti-Marcionite in origin and intention. It is further of interest to note that, while there are no separate prologues to Acts and Revelation—books which Marcion expressly repudiated—the Lucan prologue emphasizes the Lucan authorship of Acts and the Johannine and apostolic authorship of Revelation. The Matthæan prologue is unfortunately missing.

What a glimpse this offers us of the beginning of the formation of our New Testament! The rapid spread of Marcion's rival church, using an inadequate New Testament, called for an effective reply. So the Church issued the fourfold Gospel with a brief but scarcely

[2] *Revue Bénédictine*, xxiv. (1907), pp. 1–16.

[3] ibid., xl (1928), pp. 192–214. See also Harnack, *Die ältesten Evangelien-Prologe und die Bildung des Neuen Testaments* (Berlin, 1928).

veiled polemical introduction, together with the Pauline Letters—including the Pastorals—appropriating the already popular Marcionite introductions ('not observing', as Harnack says, 'the cloven hoof') wherever they were available. Later on an enlarged edition was provided with letters from other Apostles. But prologues were now no longer needed. Marcion's Bible is lost. Its recovery would delight the textual critic, and Harnack has done all that can now be done to reconstruct the text from quotations in ancient writers who had it before them. Marcion's achievement is to have provoked the Christian Church to face the problem of selection and rejection as it gradually fixed its standard of authority for faith and practice.

(2) Let us now leap over half a century from the death of Marcion and recall the debt we owe to one of the greatest biblical scholars in the ancient Church. We pass from Rome to Alexandria, from the centre of imperial administration to the first centre of Christian scholarship.

ORIGEN (A.D. 185–253), the outstanding scholar and theologian in the ante-Nicene Church, was not yet seventeen when his father suffered martyrdom in the persecution under Severus. His education had been his father's proud concern, and he had studied under Pantænus and Clement in the famous catechetical school of Alexandria. Leonides lost his property as well as his life in the persecution, so the young Origen, who had already collected a library, supported his mother and six brothers by teaching. Before long he was appointed by the Bishop of Alexandria to be head of the

far-famed school when he was only eighteen years old. He sold his library of classical authors in exchange for a tiny annuity that he might secure independence. His wide range of knowledge, his sound insistence upon a grounding in physics and philosophy, and his fervent devotion to theology attracted a large attendance of pupils. As many of these were not of the Christian faith, Origen devoted himself to the works of pagan philosophers, and studied for a while under Ammonius Saccas, the founder of the neo-Platonic school of philosophy. In this way he equipped himself to answer the arguments of those who assailed Christianity. His breadth of outlook and certain of his theological speculations roused misgivings in some Christian circles, but the fact that many of his pupils witnessed their good confession in the time of persecution and that he exposed himself again and again to the same fate proved his loyalty to Christ. Moreover, his extremely ascetic mode of life won confidence in his sincerity. Indeed, it was this fanatical observance of the evangelic rule of self-denial that led to the most painful conflict in his life. Demetrius, the Bishop of Alexandria, had been his friend, and had nominated Origen to the headship of the famous school. It was but natural that the most learned teacher in the Church should be raised to the rank of presbyter. However, Demetrius forbade this because of the youthful zeal that had led Origen to give a literal meaning to our Lord's reference to those who become eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. In the year 215 Origen was forced to leave Alexandria for a season on account of local tumults, and while

teaching at Cæsarea he was invited by the Bishops of Jerusalem and Cæsarea to expound the Scriptures in the public services of the Church. This offended Demetrius, who recalled him to Alexandria. Here, by the generosity of one of his converts, he was provided with stenographers to take down his lectures and with scribes to make copies of them for circulation. After twenty-five years at Alexandria he was invited to visit Achaia, and on his way conferred with his friends at Cæsarea, where he was ordained presbyter by the Palestinian bishops. On his return to Alexandria he found that this procedure had incurred the hostility of Bishop Demetrius, who, with other bishops in Egypt, excommunicated him. He left the city of his birth and fame never to return. For the remaining years of his life he made Cæsarea his home, and there carried on his tireless work as teacher, expositor, and theologian. The persecution under Maximin interrupted his labours for a year or two, but it was in the Decian persecution (249–51) that Origen endured torture as a confessor, and, though the emperor's death set him free, his sufferings led to his death in his sixty-ninth year in 253.

Such, in briefest outline, is the story of the career of the most attractive leader and the most versatile theologian in the first three centuries. For an account of his life and writings you must read the sixth book of Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History*. Bishop Westcott has written a fine biography of Origen in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, and a charming essay in his book *Religious Thought in the West*. We are now concerned

specially with the significance of Origen in the history of biblical scholarship.

In immediate contrast to Marcion is Origen's acceptance of the Old Testament as part of the divine revelation. He is less aware of the difficulties raised for the Christian by much that it contains. It was inevitable that a biblical scholar brought up in Alexandria should resort to allegory in the handling of scripture. Here it was that Philo had shown that a Jew could acknowledge both Moses and Plato as his masters. Origen's own teacher and predecessor was Clement, the Christian Gnostic, who taught that our Lord had handed down through the Apostles an unwritten tradition which gave a clue to the right understanding of the hidden sense and underlying harmonies of scriptural revelation. Origen met the moral and historical objections to the Old Testament by developing a current theory of a 'spiritual sense'. He taught that there is a threefold meaning in the text of the Bible, literal, moral, and mystical. The first brings out the simple fact or precept, the second answers to the personal want of the believer, whilst the third, the mystical, illuminates features in the entire work of Redemption. Origen applied this principle of interpretation to both Old and New Testaments. The faults and dangers of this type of exposition are obvious. Westcott, himself of all modern expositors most closely akin by temperament and sympathy to the Christian Platonists of Alexandria, points out that Origen's 'main defect and the real source of his minor faults was his lack of true historic feeling'.[4] It is only

[4] *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, iv, p. 138.

in Theodore of Mopsuestia, two centuries later, that we meet with the first beginnings of a sound method, the ability to grasp the historical position of a writer and to deduce his real meaning.

What, then, is Origen's contribution? First, he studied Hebrew, and learnt from Jewish teachers much that helped him in the interpretation of passages in both Old and New Testaments. Secondly, he constructed the *Hexapla*, that monument of textual scholarship, not to be equalled till, twelve centuries later, Cardinal Ximenes produced the wonderful *Complutensian Polyglot* at the University of Cordova, and a century and a half later still Bishop Brian Walton supervised that glory of seventeenth-century English scholarship and typography, the famous *Polyglot* that bears his name. In this vast work Origen gave, in six parallel columns, the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, then a transliteration of this in Greek letters, then in the next four columns the Greek translations of Aquila, of Symmachus, of the LXX, and of Theodotion. The most important column was the fifth, the critical text of the LXX, for by an ingenious system of diacritical signs Origen marked passages where the Greek text differs from the Hebrew by excess or defect or in arrangement. An abridged edition, the *Tetrapla*, omitted the two Hebrew columns. One of the irreparable disasters in the history of Christian writings was the destruction of the great Christian library when the Arabs captured Cæsarea in 638. There for four centuries Origen's massive tomes were preserved and consulted by scholars. Origen's text of the LXX was

edited and copied by his successors Pamphilus and Eusebius, but as the critical symbols were often omitted by later scribes, Origen's testimony to the LXX text current in his day is no longer certain. A like misfortune robs his writings on the New Testament of some of their otherwise immense textual importance. Sometimes he quoted from memory, sometimes his scripture text has been assimilated by copyists to the form with which they were more familiar, but worst of all, many of his books are extant only in the Latin translation made by Rufinus, or merged in the plagiarizing commentaries of Jerome, and there the habit of scribes to quote scripture citations according to the standard Latin text frustrates our search. Notwithstanding all this, it has been said that from Origen's voluminous expositions and homilies it would be possible to reconstruct the Greek text of a great part of the New Testament as it was known in Origen's day. Happily he did not aspire to the part of a textual critic, so that his value to us is that of a witness, not that of a judge.

One of the most recent discoveries in the realm of textual criticism in the years between the two wars shows the importance of his evidence. Two brilliant biblical scholars whose recent loss we mourn, B. H. Streeter and Kirsopp Lake, were impressed by observing that in his commentary on St. John, Origen had made use of two distinct types of text. While living at Alexandria he made constant, but not exclusive, use of the kind of text found in our two oldest uncial MSS., and for a time he continued to use this text after migrating to Cæsarea. But later on, and for the rest of

his life, he used the type of text which these scholars had detected in an interesting group of later MSS. They have accordingly identified this form of the text of the Greek Testament with that already in use at Cæsarea early in the third century. It is now known as the Cæsarean text.[6] It is found mainly in two families of cursive MSS., one whose relationship was first discovered by W. H. Ferrar of Dublin in 1868, the other grouped together by Kirsopp Lake in 1902. But the connecting link has been found in a curious late uncial MS. with a strange history. This ninth-century MS. of the Gospels, written by a scribe whose writing was as clumsy as his knowledge of Greek was poor, was discovered late in the nineteenth century in a remote valley in the Caucasus, where it had long been a kind of village fetish. At an earlier time it had belonged to a monastery at Koridethi at the far end of the Black Sea. It disappeared from sight for thirty years, but was found again in 1906. This is the one uncial MS. which represents the Cæsarean text, though traces are found of it in parts of the famous Washington Codex which C. L. Freer bought in 1906 and Professor H. A. Sanders edited in 1912. There are also some Cæsarean readings in that most recent discovery, the Chester Beatty papyrus codex, which was probably already in existence during the lifetime of Origen.

We must now ask, What was Origen's Bible? His knowledge of the Hebrew Bible with its twenty-two

[6] See B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels* (1924); K. Lake and R. P. Blake, 'The Cæsarean Text of the Gospel of Mark', *Harvard Theological Review*, xxi (1928), pp. 207–404; F. G. Kenyon, *The Text of the Greek Bible* (1937).

books raised a difficulty for one familiar with the Alexandrian Greek Bible with its excess of books over these, containing most of those included in the English Apocrypha. The so-called Septuagint was the bible of the Greek-speaking Christian Church, and Origen defends the use for edification of this wider range of scripture, though he never expounded any but the canonical books of the Old Testament. Moreover, quotations are found in his writings from such unofficial works as the *Book of Enoch*, the *Assumption of Moses*, and the *Ascension of Isaiah*. In the New Testament we find the same flexibility. While confining doctrinal authority to the four Gospels and the Acts, the thirteen Epistles of Paul, 1 Peter and 1 John, also Revelation, he refers to Hebrews, James, 2 Peter, and Jude as still in dispute, and there are allusions to several of the Apostolic Fathers and to a number of the apocryphal Gospels and Acts. The New Testament is growing, but its limits are not yet fixed.

(3) Within a few years of the death of Origen at Cæsarea there was born in that city one who was to do more than any other writer to save from total oblivion the names of many who played their part in the life of the Church in the first three centuries of its history.

Eusebius (260–340) was the devoted disciple and colleague of Pamphilus, scholar, saint, and martyr, who had enriched the library at Cæsarea with a priceless collection of Christian books. Here the two friends worked together until, early in the fourth century, the last and most terrible of the imperial persecutions broke out. In Cæsarea, in Tyre, in Egypt, Eusebius

witnessed scenes of horror—the destruction of churches, the burning of copies of the Scriptures, the wholesale torture and butchery of Christians of both sexes and every age. He was himself imprisoned, and probably owed his life to the sudden close of the reign of terror. Soon after he was unanimously elected Bishop of Cæsarea. When the Arian controversy flared up, his sympathies were, if not with the Arians, at least with his namesake of Nicomedia, the leader of the semi-Arian party. He found great favour with Constantine, was given a seat of honour at the Council of Nicæa, and only survived the emperor's death in 337 by two or three years.

Eusebius is not to be numbered with the noble army of martyrs, nor with the defenders of the faith in its classical expression. He was a voluminous writer, but his fame rests chiefly upon his *Ecclesiastical History*. The details of his life should be studied in Lightfoot's famous article in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, but the best introduction to the history and literature of the ancient Church is to steep oneself in the ten books of Eusebius's greatest work. In spite of all his faults as a historian, he deserves the tribute which Lightfoot paid in these words: 'If we reflect what a blank would be left in our knowledge of this important chapter in history if the narrative of Eusebius were blotted out, we shall appreciate our enormous debt of gratitude to him.'

If, for literary purposes alone, we were permitted to travel by the time machine in reverse gear and make one stop only, some of us would ask to be put down at Cæsarea somewhere near the end of the third century.

Here we should ask to be conducted through the library by Pamphilus and Eusebius. If the return ticket were available for a long enough period, we should take photographic apparatus to reproduce those many works of Christian antiquity which are named by Eusebius, and from some of which tantalizing quotations are given. Here we should find the oldest of the apocryphal gospels, that according to the Hebrews, also the gospels 'according to the Egyptians', 'according to the XII Apostles', 'according to Thomas', 'after Matthias', 'according to Peter', as well as 'the Preaching of Peter' and the 'Acts of Paul', for all these were in Origen's library. Then we should find fifty letters of Origen's collected by Eusebius, only two of which survive. We should be able to refer to Papias's five books of *Expositions of Dominical Oracles*. It would be tedious to wade through the whole of this, but curiosity would compel us to find out whether two very late writers[6] of the seventh and ninth centuries respectively are right in saying that in the second book Papias reports that James and John were slain by Jews, and whether the context justifies the theory that has been built on this slender foundation. The textual critic in our company would rejoice to have the entire set of Origen's expositions of the books of scripture in the autographs, or in the very copies so carefully made by Pamphilus. He would then find how far Rufinus's Latin translation has corrupted the original, and what was the exact form of the Greek text used by the great scholar.

[6] The seventh-century epitomizer of Philip of Side (5th cent.) and the ninth-century writer George the Sinner.

Alas! That visit will never be made. We must be thankful for what Eusebius has extracted from the writings of his predecessors. All that we really know about Papias, that interesting Bishop of Hierapolis early in the second century, a disciple, directly or at one remove, of those who had known the Lord, we owe to the diligent care of Eusebius. Perhaps the finest specimen of his genius for quotation is the series of extracts from the letters of Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria (*d.* A.D. 265), the pupil and admirer of Origen, which are given in the sixth and seventh books of the *Ecclesiastical History*. The most notable of these is the first example preserved to us of the application of literary criticism to the New Testament. Dionysius shows, by an examination of the vocabulary and style of the Johannine writings, that the Gospel and Epistles come from one hand and the Apocalypse from a different author.

(4) Time allows but a brief mention of JEROME (346–420). Eusebius Hieronymus, to give him his full name, was born at Stridon, near the modern Trieste, six years after the death of his namesake the historian. At Rome, where he was baptized about his twentieth year, he enjoyed a good education, with a special training in grammar and rhetoric. He travelled in Gaul, then settled for a few years in Aquileia near his native place, with a group of companions whose zeal was divided between the ascetic life and the study of the Scriptures. Taking his many books with him, Jerome next visited Palestine, then spent some years in the desert of Chalcis in the east of Syria, where a

group of hermits had settled to practise in solitude a life of austerity in prayer and sacred study. Here he gained a knowledge of Hebrew under a Jewish Christian instructor, and borrowing a copy of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, he transcribed it and afterwards translated it into Greek and Latin. Jerome's fiery temperament involved him in quarrels with his fellow-monks, as indeed he quarrelled all through his life with friends and foes alike. He next travelled to Antioch and thence to Constantinople, where he studied under the commentator Gregory Nazianzen. At this time severe overwork injured his eyesight, and for the remaining forty years of his life he depended for his prolific literary output upon the aid of scribes.

The decisive event in his life was a visit to Rome in the spring of the year 382. Pope Damasus commissioned Jerome to revise the Old Latin Bible. His linguistic training, his tireless industry, and his indomitable will marked him out as the one man for the task. Within one year the Gospels had appeared and were quickly followed by the revised Psalter. The death of Damasus unsettled Jerome, who took his library with him and travelled again to the East, settling permanently at Bethlehem in 386. The Old Latin version of the Scriptures must have been made some time in the second century in those districts of the western Mediterranean world where Latin was the popular tongue. Valuable as the earliest surviving MSS. of this Old Latin text are for recovering a primitive form of the New Testament text, the copies in widest circulation were full of corruptions, and every fresh copy

added to the confusion. In revising the Gospels, Jerome made use of the best of the Old Latin MSS. that were available, and compared them with the finest copies of the Greek text which represented the most scholarly critical work of Alexandria. There is much doubt about the extent to which Jerome himself carefully revised the text of the rest of the New Testament. He brought out a second version of the Psalter, borrowing from Cæsarea a copy of Origen's *Hexapla*. But the more he studied the LXX the more convinced he became that instead of merely revising the Latin translation of the Greek Old Testament he must go back to the original Hebrew. He placed himself under a Jewish Rabbi for thorough tuition in Hebrew, and then set about his most formidable task. His sympathy with the Jewish outlook led him to adopt the Hebrew canon, with an indifferent treatment of the books in which the LXX exceeds the Hebrew Bible. He acknowledges, for example, that he left the text of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus untouched, and he claims to have translated Judith and Tobit (each in one day) from an Aramaic original. He probably revised the Old Latin by comparing it with an Aramaic text or midrash.

We must not turn aside to discuss his violent controversies, in which his zeal for a reputation for orthodoxy led him to denounce the teaching of Origen, whose expositions he had so largely translated and incorporated in his own commentaries. This led him also to quarrel irreconcilably with his old friend Rufinus, the exponent and translator of that great writer. It is enough to quote H. B. Swete's characterization: 'His

temper was not always sweet, or his veracity faultless, but his life was certainly one of unceasing labour, and of the fruitfulness of his scholarly leisure there can be no question.'[7]

Jerome's chief title to fame is the Vulgate, which gained recognition slowly against powerful prejudice, suffered grievously at the hands of copyists, but from the ninth century was firmly established as the Bible of the Western Church and was canonized as the official Bible of the Roman Church at the Council of Trent in 1546. Erasmus praised his style as that of the Christian Cicero. The sonorous, but not Ciceronian, Latinity of the Vulgate is one of its enduring merits.

Before we leave this survey of the early pioneers in biblical scholarship, a word must be said about one of the problems that meet us continually in the writings of the three Fathers whose work we have considered. In no respect does modern research differ more widely from Patristic testimony than in the reports which the Fathers give about Gospel origins. Eusebius quotes Papias as saying 'Matthew collected the Logia in the Hebrew language, and each one interpreted them as he could'. A literature has grown up in the last century in the attempt to interpret these words. Later, Eusebius quotes Irenæus thus: 'Now Matthew published among the Hebrews a written Gospel also in their own tongue, while Peter and Paul were preaching in Rome, and founding the Church.' A few chapters later the same historian repeats a tradition that Pantænus went to the Indians and found in their country the Gospel

[7] Swete, *Patristic Study*, p. 125.

according to Matthew in Hebrew letters which had been left there by Bartholomew. Still later, Eusebius gives a rough quotation from Origen's commentary on this Gospel to the effect that it was the first of the Gospels, and that Matthew the Apostle had composed it in the Hebrew language for those Jews who had come to believe.[8] In at least two other passages in his books Eusebius confirms this tradition. Epiphanius, certainly an unreliable witness, tells in three different passages that Matthew wrote this Gospel in Hebrew.[9] Perhaps the most explicit testimony of all comes from Jerome. These are his words: 'Matthew, also called Levi, apostle and formerly publican, composed a gospel of Christ in Hebrew for the sake of those of the circumcision who believed, but this was afterwards translated into Greek, though by what author is uncertain. The Hebrew itself has been preserved until the present day in the library at Cæsarea which Pamphilus so diligently gathered. I have also had the opportunity of having the volume described to me by the Nazarenes of Berœa [i.e. the modern Aleppo], a city of Syria, who use it.'[10] What tradition could be more strongly supported by external authority? And yet if one thing can be said with assurance on this subject it is that internal evidence proves conclusively that our first Gospel was written in Greek. But this is not all. Reference has been made already to a number of apocryphal gospels which were used by these early Fathers. Anyone who turns to that invaluable book by Montague R. James, *The*

[8] Euseb., *H.E.* III, xxxix, 16; V, viii, 2, 3; VI, xxv, 4.
[9] Epiph., *Adv. Haer.* xxx, 3, 6; li, 5. [10] Jerome, *De Vir. Illustr.* (Matth.).

Apocryphal New Testament,[11] will find there translations of all the fragments of these uncanonical gospels preserved in Patristic writings, together with introductory notes. But when we try to sort out these gospels, we find that their titles are used with confusing inaccuracy. The most feasible solution seems to be that offered by Professor Adam Fyfe Findlay in his fascinating Kerr Lectures *Byways in Early Christian Literature*.[12] He distinguishes three writings: (*a*) *The Gospel of the Ebionites*, in use among a sect of Jewish Christians living beyond the Jordan in the neighbourhood of Pella, clinging to Jewish observances and holding heretical views about the person of our Lord. It is probably to be identified with a work referred to by Origen as *The Gospel of the Twelve Apostles*, in which special prominence was given to Matthew. (*b*) *The Gospel according to the Hebrews*, a work originating possibly in Aramaic-speaking Syria, used by Greek-speaking Jewish Christians in Egypt, and held in considerable honour by Clement and Origen, though not regarded by the latter as of equal rank with the canonical Gospels. (*c*) *The Gospel of the Nazarenes*, used by groups of orthodox Christians who still clung to Jewish customs, and, because of considerable similarity to *The Gospel of the Hebrews*, sometimes given that name by Jerome. Indeed, they were probably different editions of the same original work, with wide variations. It seems evident that both of these writings, but especially *The Gospel of the Nazarenes*, drew much of their material from St. Matthew's Gospel. This may

[11] Oxford, 1924. [12] Edinburgh, 1923.

account for the error by which Jerome at first believed that he had seen the actual Hebrew original of our canonical Matthew. At a later date he writes about 'the Gospel which the Nazarenes and Ebionites use (which I have lately translated into Greek from the Hebrew, and which is called by many people the original of Matthew)'.

When we speak of the 'romance of New Testament scholarship', we think of the remarkable way in which, within the last century, the clues contained in these remains of early Christian writings have been followed up. The text of the apostolic writings is being slowly recovered. Lost books have been found, sometimes in the papyrus rolls and codices long buried in the sands of Egypt, sometimes in vellum books buried and forgotten in ancient monasteries or libraries and often concealed in a translation made centuries ago into some little-known language or dialect. The history of the Church is being rewritten as scholars read between the lines of the sacred writings, or recover the atmosphere of an age of which the records are scarce and fragmentary. Words, phrases, and allusions in the New Testament are charged with a fresh significance, because the language and laws, the habits and customs, the private and the public life of a dead world have risen from the grave before our very eyes.

It is the aim of this series of lectures in Christian biography to say something about some scholars who have sought and found, and by their toils, insight, and discoveries have made us heirs of a rich inheritance of knowledge.

Two

Two German Scholars

FOR fourteen centuries the critical study of the New Testament runs into a tunnel. It emerges again in a pleasant little German town with an ancient university. The revival of learning at the close of the Middle Ages kindled a new interest in early Christian writings and started the recovery of the Greek Testament. The awakened spirit of inquiry and the Roman Catholic criticism of the Protestant reliance upon the Scriptures were not without their effect, it is true. The rationalism which marked the English Deistic movement in the earlier part of the eighteenth century led on to the work of the Encyclopædists in France and the 'Enlightenment' in Germany. From the middle of that century analytic criticism was being applied to the books of the Old Testament, and later under Schleiermacher this method was directed to the Gospels. But the man who was to work a revolution in the study of the New Testament and to attempt to reconstruct the history of the first Christian centuries was FERDINAND CHRISTIAN BAUR.

This remarkable man was born in 1792, the son of a Protestant pastor in a small town near Stuttgart, in Württemberg. He was educated at home until he was fourteen, when he went to the theological seminary of Blaubeuren at the foot of the Swabian Alps, then

passed on to the University of Tübingen, studying with special zeal classics and philosophy, and at this time coming strongly under the influence of Fichte and Schelling. In 1814 he left the University and served for two or three years as an assistant minister in a rural charge. He was then appointed to a Professorship at Blaubeuren Seminary, where D. F. Strauss was one of his pupils, until at the early age of thirty-four he was called to the chair of Historical Theology at Tübingen. At that time one of the smallest and poorest of the German universities, Tübingen is a pre-Reformation foundation, going back to 1477. Melanchthon lectured there from 1512 to 1518, and it is not surprising that it was amongst the first to welcome the New Learning and the Reformation. A Protestant seminary was incorporated in 1537, but it was not till 1817 that a Roman Catholic faculty was added. New and old blend in this lovely little town that looks down upon the Neckar. This was the place to which the young scholar came and which for a century has given its name to the school of criticism which he founded.

The outline of his career is simple and uneventful. He held his chair from 1826 until his death in 1860. The great sorrow of his life was the death of his wife in 1839. He felt the smart of humiliation when the unpopularity of his views excluded him for a time from taking his turn as preacher in the Stiftskirche, that noble fifteenth-century basilica which serves as the University Church. It would be tedious to enumerate all the books which Baur wrote, for he was a prolific and

tireless worker. One of his pupils, Carl Weizsäcker, in a centennial oration delivered in 1892,[13] told that Baur rose regularly at four every morning, summer and winter, to work at his desk without a fire, even when the ink was frozen in the pot. So he toiled all day long with a conscientious resolve that his lectures should be prepared as carefully as though they were written for the Press.

Mark Pattison, in a well-known essay,[14] compares the portrait of Baur with that of Gibbon: 'heavy, sleepy, and somewhat coarse, giving indication of the intellectual power locked up within.' But an old school friend of mine, the Rev. A. M. Coleman,[15] who made a pilgrimage to Tübingen twenty years ago, records a different impression of the half-length oil-painting in the Ceremonial Hall of the New Aula of the University: 'The picture is one of a man of noble presence and great dignity. A broad brow with luminous blue eyes, looking steadfastly and fearlessly on the world; a face benign and passionless, yet aglow with a great passion for truth.'

Baur was in advance of his time by being a German before he was a Württemberger, and he saw a great future for the nation. But though to this extent he was a politician, his supreme interest was in his work, and he was seldom away from Tübingen. With all his

[13] *Ferdinand Christian Baur*. Rede zur akademischen Feier seines 100. Geburtstages 21. Juni 1892 in der Aula in Tübingen gesprochen von Kanzler D. Carl Weizsäcker (Stuttgart, 1892).

[14] 'Present State of Theology in Germany' (*Westminster Review*, 1857), reprinted in *Essays*, by Mark Pattison, ed. H. Nettleship, ii, pp. 210 ff. (Oxford, 1889).

[15] *Six Liberal Thinkers*, pp. 18–26 (B. Blackwell, Oxford, 1936).

industry he was no pedant. He won the love of his students by his geniality and sincerity, and was never intolerant of criticism and opposition. His aim was not to create a school of disciples, but to teach his students to see things for themselves and to make their own discoveries. Radical as his theories were, and indeed disturbing to the faith of many of his contemporaries, his own religious faith was deep and tranquil, and Weizsäcker is our authority for saying that his influence did not deflect students from their vocation to the Christian ministry, but rather confirmed those who were passing through a phase of uncertainty.

What is the place in the history of New Testament studies of this man who dominated the German school of radical criticism for half a century, who was the *bête noir* of conservative scholarship, and is now for most students a fading memory? In his own faculty at Tübingen he has today no successor. A colleague of mine who spent a year at this University not many years ago tells me that he never heard the name of Baur mentioned in the theological lecture-rooms, neither was his attention ever drawn to the portrait which once must have been the cynosure of every eye. The Tübingen school of Baur is dead in the academic world. Yet he was the real founder of the historical method in reconstructing the history of Primitive Christianity from the evidence contained in the New Testament itself. He found a clue which ought not to be ignored, but his inferences drawn from the data which he selected so acutely were mostly wrong, and

the rigidity with which he applied his theory was fatal to ultimate success.

We have seen that Marcion was the first in the long succession of New Testament critics. He insisted upon the vital importance of the conflict between Paul and the original Apostles. Baur is Marcion *redivivus*. He started with the evidence of the existence of a Christ party in Corinth, which he identified with the Cephas party. His next study led him to discern in the Pastoral Epistles an attack on Marcionite Gnosticism which dates them about the middle of the second century. In 1845 he published his epoch-making book,[16] *Paul the Apostle of Christ, his life and work, his letters and his doctrine*. In this work he carried out a thoroughgoing investigation of the Pauline Epistles and the Acts. He pointed out the irreconcilable contradiction between Acts 15 and Galatians 2 if each narrative is to be accepted as a complete and accurate record of events. By this time his conversion to the Hegelian philosophy had given him the master key to early Christian history. 'Without philosophy', he wrote, 'history always remains for me dead and dumb.' Henceforth the whole New Testament was re-examined in the light of the Hegelian series, thesis, antithesis, synthesis. Judaic legalism and Pauline liberalism find their harmony in the picture of the Catholic Church offered to us in the Acts of the Apostles.

[16] Baur's *The Church History of the First Three Centuries* was published in 1853. An English translation of the third edition by Allan Menzies appeared in the Theological Translation Fund Library in 1878. The English translation of *Paulus* is dated London, 1873–5.

Baur is undeniably right in contending that the Acts gives a softer picture of the struggle which Paul had waged against a strong party of Jewish Christians who claimed as their leaders the 'pillars' of the Jerusalem Church, Peter, John, and James, the brother of our Lord. Galatians and the Corinthian epistles, and, with less asperity, Romans, are vibrant with indignation. Paul's 'Gospel' has been assailed, his credentials are disputed. The reason for this is clear. Palestinian Christians were rooted in their ancestral Judaism. The Torah was God's unique gift to the Jewish race. It contained in an indissoluble unity moral and ceremonial commandments and prescriptions. Jesus was Himself a Jew, and His own disciples would surely know on His authority the Christian way of life. They had no desire to break with their compatriots. The one open secret which they proclaimed to the scandal of official Judaism was that the Messiah had already come, and that his name was Jesus, who would come again from heaven with great power and glory. Meanwhile, they were ready to welcome any Gentile converts on the simple condition that they underwent the rite of initiation into Judaism, and conformed to the moral and dietary regulations of their Jewish fellow-Christians. Paul, however, was carrying on a victorious campaign in one Roman province after another, always starting in the Jewish synagogues of the Diaspora. Why should his Gentile converts have to submit to the yoke of the Jewish Law? It was alien to their entire way of life and irrelevant to their need. In a great city like Antioch, meeting-place of East and West, the

problem of table-fellowship was bound soon to arise. It was there that the first conflict between Peter and Paul took place. But as tidings reached the mother-church at Jerusalem of the results of the Pauline mission farther afield, enthusiastic emissaries of the conservative wing of Palestinian Christianity followed in the track of the Apostle of the Gentiles, challenged his credentials, and undermined his apostolic authority. This led to a deep cleavage in the Church, and the marks of the controversy are to be read in every genuine book of the New Testament. So Baur alleged. Those four polemical epistles of Paul which deal with the anti-Pauline warfare and form his counter-attack are indisputably authentic. All the others, since they bear no scars of the conflict, are almost certainly post-Pauline. It is odd that Baur missed the relevance of Philippians to this controversy. The Revelation of John must be genuine, because it was written by one of the 'pillar' Apostles and contains thinly veiled allusions breathing bitter enmity to Paul. The Gospels also must be tried by this test. The Petrine Matthew is clearly the earliest because of its Jewish colouring and its exaltation of the Apostle with the keys. Luke is Pauline and has a separate origin. Mark is later, for it represents Jesus as abrogating the ceremonial law, whilst John is an idealized picture which lays no claim to historical truth and is dated about the year A.D. 170. The most curious assumption in this treatment of the Gospels is that all of them are supposed to be secondary and are based on some older Gospel, such as those apocryphal works mentioned in the previous lecture.

It was part of Baur's theory that all four were written with a deliberate tendency.

So far Baur was relying upon what he believed to be internal evidence within the New Testament of a conflict between the Petrine and the Pauline parties. In support of this hypothesis he discovered evidence in the curious pseudo-Clementine writings of the fourth century.[17] Behind these works recent criticism discovers a popular romance, called *The Circuits of Peter*, which originated in some Judæo-Christian sect about the middle of the third century. It assumed the form of a letter from Clement, Bishop of Rome, near the end of the first century, to James, the Lord's brother. This describes his meeting with Peter and his conversion, followed by Peter's travels down the coast from Cæsarea to Antioch, and culminating in Clement's recognition at Syrian Laodicea of his father, mother, and brothers from whom he had been separated since childhood. This romance has come down to us in two abridgements known as the *Clementine Recognitions* and the *Clementine Homilies*, which may both be dated late in the fourth century, and which amplify the original novel, one in the direction of religious edification, the other in the interests of philosophical doctrine. One of the religious debates described in this romance is the controversy between Peter and Simon Magus. The incident recorded in the Acts provides a historical background for a veiled attack upon the Apostle Paul, who is certainly to be identified with Simon, though

[17] See Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, Part I, vol. i. Also J. V. Bartlet's article in *Ency. Brit.*, 11th ed. (1910), vi, pp. 49 ff.

sometimes he is designated 'the Enemy'. The ground of the attack is that he stirred up persecution against the infant Church, that he claimed equal apostolical authority with the Twelve because of his experience at Damascus, and that he opposed the true Apostles and their representatives, especially in his rebuke of Peter at Antioch.

Baur seized upon this late legend to show that the Lucan story of Simon Magus [18] was a modification of an early Jewish-Christian tradition at a time when its anti-Pauline motive was forgotten, and that the ecclesiastical traditions about Peter's mission to the Gentiles and his death in Rome were an unhistorical imitation of the apostolic labours of Paul. We need not discuss this far-fetched theory, but we can see how all this was grist to Baur's mill. There was evidently a far larger and more serious cleavage in the Primitive Church than had been generally recognized. The Jewish Christians of Palestine regarded their apostolic ministry and their loyalty to the full observance of the Torah as orthodox Christianity. Paul's Gentile mission led to a revolution in the Christian Church, and the antagonism between the two sections only gradually cooled, until in the middle of the second century the alarming spread of Gnosticism compelled the two wings of the army to merge in a solid defence against the common danger. It was at this stage that Baur would place the Acts of the Apostles (about 140) as a late and largely unhistorical contribution to the task of reconciliation.

[18] For Simon Magus, see article by R. P. Casey in *Beginnings of Christianity*, ed. by Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, v, pp. 151 ff.

There are so many obvious flaws in this elaborate theory of the early history of the Church that it may seem a waste of time to call it to mind a hundred years later. For one thing, Paul makes it perfectly clear in Galatians, one of the letters acknowledged by Baur, that his Gospel was whole-heartedly accepted by the 'pillar' Apostles. In the next place, it is evident that Peter was not in sharp antagonism to Paul, whose indignation was roused by Peter's vacillation when the ultra-conservatives, those who are called 'people from James', came down from Jerusalem and created a panic amongst the more liberal Jewish Christians. Even then it was not so much a doctrinal cleavage as a difference based on expediency. They protested against creating a precedent which prejudged an issue that had not yet been settled by ecclesiastical authority. The most devastating breach in the Tübingen position has been made by the critical comparison of the Synoptic Gospels. The priority of Mark is now universally recognized except in Roman Catholic circles, which have to accept the decisions of the Biblical Commission. With few exceptions all critical scholars would place the four Gospels within the first century or very early in the second. The most likely date for Acts is in the years following the fall of Jerusalem, when the destruction of the Temple brought to an end the sacrificial system.[19] The flight of Jewish Christians to Pella ended once for all the connexion between Palestinian Christianity and

[19] The most plausible argument for a date near the end of the first century is that by Krenkel, alleging a dependence upon the *Antiquities* of Josephus. See the discussion in *Beginnings of Christianity*, ii, and T. W. Manson, in Rylands Library *Bulletin*, xxvii, 2, pp. 21 ff.

the Jewish religious community. It was now that Christian leaders had to show that the Church was not in league with the fierce rebellion of Galilee and Jerusalem. If there is an apologetic motive in the Acts, it is the desire to show that converts to Christianity throughout the Empire were loyal citizens, and that whenever their missionary leader was brought before a Roman tribunal his good citizenship was vindicated and the malice of his Jewish accusers was exposed. The study of the Revelation of John has been so completely transformed by research into the apocalyptic literature as well as by source criticism that Baur's treatment of this book has become completely antiquated.

Why, then, is it worth while to recall a German scholar whose most famous book brought trepidation into the hearts of the faithful just over a hundred years ago? The first reason is that Baur sought to discover the historical situation as it can be learnt in the New Testament itself, in freedom from theological prejudice or ecclesiastical authority. The method is abused only when the degree of critical eccentricity is regarded as the measure of a scholar's intellectual honesty. Every pioneer such as Baur calls attention to salient points which have received too little consideration hitherto. The theories which he formulates to account for these data must submit to the most searching examination in their turn. In the second place, Baur, like Marcion, brought into prominence the signal importance of the Apostle Paul in the emergence of Christianity as a universal religion. Paul understood that side of the

message of Jesus with a discernment missing in the Twelve. In the third place, there is a recurrent interest in these same problems. Within the last seven years two of our leading New Testament scholars have returned to Baur, without accepting his results. Professor T. W. Manson of Manchester University, in a series of lectures published in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*,[20] and also in his Presidential address before the Society for Historical Theology at Oxford, acknowledges the stimulus which he has received from Baur's *Paulus* in reconsidering the situation which lies behind the Philippian, Galatian, and Corinthian correspondence. He has also shown how Baur, three generations ago, anticipated the principle of *Sitz im Leben*, of which the Form-critics make so much: 'What period in the history of the Primitive Church provides the natural context for the ideas or practices described in this book?' The other writer, who comes far nearer than Dr. Manson to Marcion and Baur, is the American scholar, Professor John Knox, formerly of Chicago, now of Union Seminary, New York. His book, *Marcion and the New Testament*,[21] points to conclusions from which I strongly dissent, but it is certainly a book of outstanding importance which will reopen controversies that have slumbered for half a century. Baur asked the right questions: he gave the wrong answers.

Adolf von Harnack und Ferd. Christ. von Baur is the title of an essay which Ernst Troeltsch contributed to

[20] xxiii–xxvi (1939–42), 'Paul in Ephesus'.

[21] University of Chicago Press (1942).

the *Festgabe*[22] which Harnack's colleagues and friends presented to him on his seventieth birthday. I have no intention here of giving a summary of the discriminating parallel between the two historians drawn out by Troeltsch, but will quote one sentence: 'I am convinced that in a retrospect of the scientific achievement of the Protestant theology of the nineteenth century, the names of Baur and Harnack will stand in the forefront. And in so far as we define scientific theology as historical theology which is completely conformed to the general historical method, all the more will these two be recognized as the towering peaks in the theology of the period.'

HARNACK's career is one unbroken record of brilliant success. He was fortunate in his family and birth, for his father was a renowned Lutheran theologian who was Professor at Dorpat when Adolf was born in 1851. Cradled and fostered in university surroundings, it was but natural that he should follow an academic career. He studied at the Universities of Dorpat and Leipzig. At the age of twenty-three he was lecturer in Church History at Leipzig, was called to a chair at Giessen at twenty-eight, seven years later was promoted to the corresponding chair at Marburg, and then at thirty-seven, in spite of strong conservative opposition, he was called to a chair at Berlin, the premier University in Germany. From 1876 till his death in 1930 his literary output was incredibly prolific. Apart from his innumerable books, brochures, and pamphlets, he edited, together with Zahn and von Gebhardt, the

[22] *Festgabe von Fachgenossen und Freunden* (Tübingen, 1921), pp. 282 f.

works of the Apostolic Fathers; with von Gebhardt he also edited a series of learned monographs under the general heading *Studies and Researches*,[23] dealing with special investigations in the field of New Testament and Patristic study, and, as if this were not enough, he founded and edited, with the help of Schürer, the fortnightly periodical *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, which was devoted entirely to reviews of books in theology in all its branches. In addition to his professorial lectures and his editorial and literary duties, in 1880 he became a very active member of the Prussian Academy of Sciences and later on wrote its history; in 1905 he became head of the National Library in Berlin, and in 1910 assumed the presidency of the Kaiser Wilhelm Society for the Promotion of the Sciences, and it was while visiting Heidelberg in the interests of this Society in his eightieth year that he was overtaken by his fatal illness.[24]

In appearance and personality Harnack was a striking contrast to F. C. Baur. Whereas the Tübingen professor seems to have read his carefully prepared lectures in a rather monotonous voice, Harnack was rapid, animated, and humorous. I remember forty years ago hearing a Scottish minister who had been a student under Harnack describe the German professor's swift entrance into his lecture-room, his rapid stride to the desk, and the eloquence with which he poured out his matter with scarcely a note in front of him, citing the relevant passages from the Greek and

[23] *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur.*
[24] See *Theologische Blätter*, ix, 7 (Juli 1930).

Latin Fathers of the second and third centuries in the original from memory. Two portraits, one printed in a volume of essays given to him when he was seventy, another taken presumably near the end of his life and issued with a memorial tribute by Professor Hans von Soden, give a vivid impression of the man. In both we are struck by the shock of upstanding hair, the bristling moustache, but above all by the eyes behind the spectacles, humorously keen and telling of a mind tingling with vitality.

There is an interesting story of the way in which his most widely circulated book came to be written. In the winter of 1899–1900 Harnack was asked to lecture about the Christian religion at an hour when students from all faculties could listen to him. He announced that on certain mornings during that semester he would lecture at six o'clock. Morning after morning at the time announced Harnack strode to his desk and without manuscript or note poured forth his lectures on the *Essence of Christianity*[25] to a crowded audience of 600 men and women. When asked to publish them, he answered that they had never even been written. Happily a student had taken them down in shorthand without the lecturer's knowledge. When Harnack was presented with a complete typed transcript, he yielded to the many pleas that he would publish the lectures. They went to the Press practically without revision. At the time of his death over seventy thousand copies in German had been sold, and the book had been translated into fifteen languages. It was published in

[25] *Das Wesen des Christentums.*

English under the title *What is Christianity?* and was for many years the most popular theological work. The sixteen lectures formed a delightfully readable account of some aspects of the teaching of Jesus. This explanation of the Christian religion became the recognized exposition of what came to be known as Liberal Protestantism. It was fairly but severely criticized in a pamphlet[26] by Professor Sanday of Oxford, who gave full credit for the excellent treatment of some portions of the Synoptic records of Christ's teaching. But Harnack was temperamentally unable to appreciate the value of three important elements in the Christian religion as we know it: the Church, Doctrine, and Worship, and it was on these points that Dr. Sanday's exposure was most ruthless.

Meanwhile, another small book had made an inconspicuous entrance into the world. This was written by a young assistant minister at Strassburg, and bore the title, *The Secret of Jesus' Messiahship and Passion.*[27] It was the exact opposite of Harnack's picture of Jesus and His kingdom, for that represented Jesus as quite free from the current Jewish expectation of a sudden and violent coming of the kingdom of God. Albert Schweitzer did not see in Jesus a calm and placid preacher of a new and peaceful social order based on the Fatherhood of God and the infinite worth of the human

[26] *An Examination of Harnack's 'What is Christianity?'*, by W. Sanday (London: Longmans, 1925).

[27] *Das Messianitäts- und Leidensgeheimnis* (Tübingen, 1901). English translation, *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God*, by W. Lowrie (London, 1925).

soul, and brought about by the higher righteousness and the fulfilment of the commandment of love. Instead, he recognized a Figure of volcanic force who proclaimed the imminent end of the present world order. The keyword which alone explains all the teaching of Jesus is the term Eschatology. Within five years this young Privatdocent had published a remarkable book[28] which surveyed the critical work written in Germany and France during a century and a quarter on the Gospels and the Life of Jesus, and carried farther his contention that the eschatological key alone would unlock every problem. As the subject of our present lectures is the romance of New Testament scholarship, I may be allowed to continue this parenthesis a little farther. In spite of his unorthodox views, which led to his rejection as a candidate for the mission-field, this young Alsatian who had won doctorates in Philosophy and in Music, and was organist to the Bach Societies in Strassburg and Paris, earned enough by his music and his lecturing to study medicine until he had gained a doctorate in that faculty also. He had set his heart on going to the French Congo as a medical missionary, and in 1913 he set up a hospital at Lambaréné in Equatorial Africa. Just before leaving Europe he published another book, doing for the Apostle Paul what his earlier book had done for the Life of Jesus. On the Continent Schweitzer's books did not make a deep impression, but the English translations, brilliantly carried out by William Montgomery, and aided by such alluring titles as *The Quest of the*

[28] *Von Reimarus zu Wrede* (Tübingen, 1906).

Historical Jesus and *Paul and His Interpreters*,[29] together with the enthusiastic advertisement given by the leading divinity professors at Oxford and Cambridge, William Sanday and F. C. Burkitt, aroused great interest for a time. Then came the world war, and all news of Schweitzer ceased. The eschatological interpretation of the teaching of Jesus was forgotten. But after the war the general collapse of ordered life plunged the civilized world into a mood of despair. The apocalyptic element in the Gospels no longer seemed so irrelevant as it had a few years before. Then Schweitzer reappeared, and the attraction of his Bach recitals and his public lectures renewed the interest which his books had kindled in the days before the deluge. Once again Eschatology was in the picture. In due course the extremes to which it had been carried were abandoned, and under the guidance first of Rudolf Otto and then of Professor C. H. Dodd, a fresh presentation of this element in our Lord's teaching in the form of 'realized eschatology' claimed the attention of students of the New Testament.

We may now return to Harnack, for thirty years of incessant literary activity followed his famous lectures to which Schweitzer's first booklet was the counter-blast. Like Baur, Harnack came to the New Testament documents as a historian of the Early Church. In this role he is best known by his monumental *History of Dogma* and *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*. But the book which first

[29] *Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung* (Tübingen, 1911; E.T., 1912). This was followed by *Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus* (Tübingen, 1930; E.T., London, 1931).

proved the immense weight of his learning in its bearing on New Testament introduction was *The Chronology of Early Christian Literature*. The first part of this huge volume runs to over 700 pages, in which the date and genuineness of every surviving Christian writing to the end of the second century is discussed. Harnack was an advanced liberal in his critical and theological views. He could not be regarded as an apologist for traditional judgements. His knowledge of every nook and cranny in that strange world of a bygone age, his familiarity with every kind of writing and every phase of controversy, gave to his judgement an exceptional value. It was therefore with surprise that readers found in the preface (written in 1896) that Harnack declared, 'In the criticism of the sources of the earliest Christianity we are unquestionably in a movement backwards towards tradition'.

This was illustrated by Harnack himself in a series of four books which came out in 1906 and the following years. Their English titles are *Luke the Physician*, *The Sayings of Jesus*, *The Acts of the Apostles*, and *The Date of the Acts and the Synoptic Gospels*. Many students who shrink from wrestling with some of Harnack's massive volumes can read these with ease, and they certainly will not read them without profit. I do not mean that negative criticism has been silenced by the impressive arguments used forty years ago in favour of the unity and Lucan authorship of the Third Gospel and Acts, or that there are no difficulties to be met. But when one reads that 'the best critics regard the Acts as a composite work written in the second cen-

tury', or that 'all the best scholars reject the Lucan authorship of the Gospel and Acts', it is well to remember the great name of Harnack.

One of the most valuable of Harnack's later works, published when he was seventy, is his volume on Marcion. This is the fullest account we have of that strange genius, with a study of his theology and a text of his New Testament so far as it can be reconstructed from quotations made by those Fathers who replied to Marcion's heresy, or referred to him in their books. It is an excellent illustration of the truth of C. H. Turner's dictum that textual criticism is a branch of Church history.[30] Another branch of Church history is the story of the growth of the canon of the New Testament. How did certain books come to be regarded as of peculiar authority for the faith and life of the Christian community? There is probably no book which tells the story more fully and with greater lucidity than that translated into English under the title *The Origin of the New Testament*.[31] But if that tells us how some books were recognized as suitable for public reading in Church services, another, *Bible Reading in the Early Church*,[32] tells us all that is to be known about an equally important subject, though seldom spoken about, the private reading of the Bible in the homes of the people.

[30] *Journal of Theological Studies*, x, p. 13 (October, 1908).

[31] *Die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments und die wichtigsten Folgen des neuen Schöpfung* (Leipzig, 1914; E.T., London, 1925). To this should be added *Die Briefsammlung des Apostels Paulus* (Leipzig, 1926).

[32] *Ueber den privaten Gebrauch der Heiligen Schriften in der Alten Kirche* (Leipzig, 1912; E.T., London, 1912).

We have already seen that Harnack was an active member of the Royal Prussian Academy of the Sciences. Many of his most valuable papers were published as reprints from its *Proceedings*. One of the best of these was a masterly exposition of Paul's Hymn of Love, with exhaustive footnotes.[33] About thirty-five years ago an English translation of this appeared serially in the once famous monthly magazine *The Expositor*. It shows what gifts as an exegete Harnack possessed, though they were seldom exercised. To some it may seem the mere extravagance of an enthusiast to suggest that there is any real romance in such a life as I have tried to picture. Yet there is surely something enthralling in the thought of the active mind continuing in the tireless pursuit of truth, exploring the main roads and the byways of the distant past to bring before our eyes all that can be known about the lives and writings of those who did so much to shape the course of Christian history in those momentous generations. Harnack not only gave himself unsparingly to the acquisition of knowledge, he shared all that he found with others. Already by the time he was seventy-five the titles of his publications numbered 1,658, and his pen was busy for five years more. It is an astonishing harvest of the years.

If the question is asked, Did this man of prodigious learning about the Christian Bible and Church enter deeply into its spirit and inward meaning?, the answer

[33] *Das hohe Lied des Apostels Paulus von der Liebe* (1 *Kor.* 13) *und seine religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung* (Berlin, 1911). See also *Expositor*, VIII, iii (1912).

in part may be found in a little volume translated into English after his death. It is called *A Scholar's Testament.*[31] These meditations formed part of a correspondence which brought consolation and strength to a friend during a time of sorrow and pain. She decided to share them with others, and gained the writer's consent before his death. In a brief preface she writes: 'As a scholar Adolf von Harnack was well known throughout the world. Few, however, knew that his main concern was with the life of the soul in God, in the spirit of Jesus Christ. On one occasion he wrote in a private letter: "To be strong in the inward man means everything!" '

[31] *A Scholar's Testament.* Meditations by Adolf von Harnack. Translated by Olive Wyon (London, 1933).

Three

The Cambridge Triumvirate

IT was in the year after Queen Victoria's accession to the throne that a new head master was appointed to the fine old Grammar School on the foundation of King Edward VI, which had just moved into the stately building in New Street, Birmingham. James Prince Lee had served as an assistant master at Rugby under the great Dr. Arnold, and brought to his fresh position, not only high attainments as a classical scholar, but also strong convictions on the place of divinity in the curriculum of a school. During his ten years as head master he inspired with his enthusiasm three boys, who went up from his school to Cambridge to win high honours at the University, and were destined to leave a deep impress on the life and thought of the English Church. Archbishop Benson must not detain us now, for it is not as author of a commentary on the Revelation of John, but as a great statesman of the Church, that he will always be remembered. He was in his schooldays the bosom friend of Joseph Barber Lightfoot, afterwards Bishop of Durham, of whom I shall have much more to say. In that picturesque *Life* of the Archbishop,[35] his son has preserved a recollection of the two younger boys who often watched with

[35] *The Life of Edward White Benson, Archbishop of Canterbury*, by A. C. Benson, i, p. 26 (London, 1899).

admiration the head boy as he stood with the seniors of the Sixth in the big school around the railed-in square which enclosed the seat of Wisdom. Brooke Foss Westcott, the favourite pupil of the head master, is seen in the privileged attitude of standing with head resting on his hand against the rail as he repeats without a flaw his allotted portion from the classics. Westcott went up to Trinity, and Lightfoot, who followed him a few years later, became one of a small band of enthusiastic pupils. We must not linger over the years which Westcott spent as a master at Harrow, but we shall come back some twenty years later to find these two, together with Fenton John Anthony Hort, working a revolution in the study of theology in the University of Cambridge.

It was under LIGHTFOOT (1828–89) that this work started. From the time when he was elected Hulsean Professor of Divinity in 1861, he began lecturing on the New Testament, and more especially on the Epistles of St. Paul. His thoroughness and lucidity of exposition and his vigorous delivery gave them a quality that soon attracted the widest attention. As the numbers grew, the largest lecture-rooms in Cambridge were too small to hold the crowds that gathered to hear the young Professor, until at last the great hall of Trinity College was used. William Hepworth Thompson, the Master of Trinity, known for his cynical humour and mordant wit, described with enthusiasm the passage between the Senate House and Caius College 'black with the fluttering gowns of students' as they hurried to get even standing room at Lightfoot's

lectures. In 1875 he became Lady Margaret Professor, and combined with his Cambridge academic duties from 1871 to 1879 a canonry at St. Paul's Cathedral, where in his own quite different way he was a worthy colleague of that Bossuet of the English pulpit, Henry Parry Liddon.

Meanwhile, Lightfoot was acquiring that massive knowledge of early Christian literature, especially of the second and third centuries, which was to give him an unchallenged supremacy in this field of scholarship. His great expositions of Galatians, Philippians, and Colossians introduced an altogether new type of commentary. Apart from a fresh text largely based on the researches of his friends Westcott and Hort, the linguistic notes were illuminating without an oppressively philological display, but the two main features were the terse summary paraphrases of each paragraph of the epistle, written in vigorous English, and the dissertations on such subjects as 'St. Paul and the Three', 'The Christian Ministry', 'Essenism and Christianity'. Eighty years have come and gone since those two commentaries on Galatians and Philippians first saw the light. They are still indispensable tools for any student starting on the careful examination of the Pauline Epistles. In three respects they are open to criticism. Unfortunately, the new light shed by the papyri on the vocabulary of the Hellenistic Greek had not then become available, though strangely enough an extract from a student's note-book shows that as far back as the year 1863 Lightfoot foretold the change that would result from our use of the letters written

by ordinary people in our study of the language of the New Testament. In the second place, the widespread recognition that the Galatians to whom Paul wrote were the inhabitants of the southern part of the Roman province of Galatia, the people who lived in Iconium, Derbe, and Lystra, and not the dwellers in the more distant north of Asia Minor, has provided us with a more likely background for that epistle. But the most serious defect is that which his friend Hort was quick to point out. 'Doctrinal questions are almost entirely avoided, as Lightfoot means to leave them for Romans. However, this is certainly the weakest point of the book.'[36] These three were the only commentaries which Lightfoot lived to publish, though notes most carefully written for lectures or else taken down by eager pupils, together with some dissertations, were published after his death as fragments of priceless value under the titles, *Notes on Epistles of St. Paul* and *Biblical Essays*. Yet, great as these books are, Lightfoot's most enduring fame rests upon the five volumes devoted to the Apostolic Fathers, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and Polycarp. Professor C. H. Turner, himself one of the acknowledged authorities on the history of the Church in the second century, speaks of 'this superb edition' as 'the greatest contribution made to patristic learning in the last two centuries'.[37] His verdict is 'the Ignatian controversy has now been set at rest: criticism has done

[36] *Life and Letters of Fenton J. A. Hort*, by A. F. Hort, ii, p. 35 (London, 1896).

[37] *The Study of the New Testament*, 1883 and 1920, by C. H. Turner, p. 14. An Inaugural Lecture delivered before the University of Oxford (Oxford University Press, 2nd ed., 1924).

its work, and the genuineness of the letters can never again be called in question'. The great authority of Harnack speaks to the same effect.

To explain the importance of Ignatius in dealing with Christian origins, and the place which his name occupies in the controversies of the nineteenth century, a few words are necessary about Ignatius himself, and the form in which his letters have come down to us. Eusebius tells us, in his *Ecclesiastical History*,[38] that Ignatius, the third Bishop of Syrian Antioch, was condemned to be sent to Rome in the time of Trajan to be thrown to the beasts in the amphitheatre. On his journey he saw the Churches at Ephesus, Magnesia, and Tralles, and while stopping at Smyrna he wrote to these Churches and also sent a letter in advance to the Church at Rome. When he reached Troas, he wrote to the Philadelphians and the Smyrnæans, and a personal letter to Polycarp, the Bishop of Smyrna. In another work[39] Eusebius dates the martyrdom of Ignatius in Rome at A.D. 108. By general consent, this date is too early. Now through the Middle Ages a collection of letters was known, purporting to be those of Ignatius, but containing, in addition to the seven named by Eusebius, six others which by internal evidence are

[38] *H.E.*, III, xxxvi. In III, xxii, Eusebius writes of Ignatius as 'the second Bishop of Antioch where Evodius had been the first'. In the later passage Ignatius is spoken of as 'the second after Peter to succeed to the bishopric of Antioch'.

[39] *Chronicon*, ii, pp. 158, 162 (ed. Schoene), quoted by Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II, i, pp. 145 f., who shows that in the *Chronicon* Eusebius offers only an approximate date (ibid., II, ii, pp. 447 ff. See also C. H. Turner, *Studies in Early Church History*, pp. 135 ff., also P. N. Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians*, pp. 209 ff.).

obviously not genuine, whilst even the seven have many interpolations. In the middle of the seventeenth century texts of the seven genuine epistles were discovered, first by Archbishop Ussher in a Latin translation, then by Isaac Voss in the Greek original. Since then fragments have come to light in Coptic and Syriac translations, and in an Armenian translation made from the Syriac text. In 1845 Dr. Cureton discovered among some Nitrian MSS. in the British Museum a Syriac MS. containing three only of the Ignatian epistles, namely, those to Polycarp, to the Ephesians, and to the Romans. An acute controversy then arose about the genuineness of the letters of Ignatius. Critical scholars had long since rejected the six letters. Were they now to regard the four found in the Voss-Ussher recension, but not in the Curetonian MS., as spurious? This was the problem which Lightfoot set himself to solve by long and patient research. He started with a strong inclination to accept only the three, but his keen historical judgement brought him round to the clear conviction that the seven letters mentioned by Eusebius are indeed the genuine Epistles of Ignatius as we have them today, and Lightfoot was able to edit the text with the aid of various Greek MSS., and versions of them that have survived in whole or in part in a variety of languages.

This great edition of Ignatius and Polycarp was published in 1885, and a second edition appeared in 1889 a few months before the author's death. But Lightfoot's judgement on this important subject had been announced some years before in the course of one

of the most curious episodes in the history of theological controversy.

In 1874 a book appeared without an author's name entitled *Supernatural Religion*, which denied the credibility of miracles and assailed the authenticity of the books of the New Testament. The book made a great parade of learning, which imposed upon the reviewers who took the author's pretensions at their face value. An unaccountable rumour attributed the book to Bishop Thirlwall, one of the most erudite scholars of the age, who had just retired from the see of St. David's. With such undeserved advertisement, *Supernatural Religion* achieved a *succès de scandale*, and ran through edition after edition. Unfortunately for himself, the anonymous author had gone out of his way to impugn the honesty of Dr. Westcott, charging him with 'what amounts to a falsification of the text'. This brought Professor Lightfoot with his heaviest artillery into the fray. He not only vindicated his old friend and former Trinity tutor, but proved the author of this book to be imperfectly acquainted with the rudiments of Greek and Latin grammar. Moreover, Lightfoot, with characteristic thoroughness, verified the references in the imposing lists of authorities cited in every chapter, and convicted the author of lifting entire groups of references unread from some other work on the subject. These articles, which appeared from time to time in the *Contemporary Review*, had an immediate effect. In that charming book *Lightfoot of Durham*, the late Dean of Lichfield gives a striking example of this. He records a conversation some years afterwards with

a well-known bookseller, who told him, 'When the book *Supernatural Religion* appeared it had an extraordinary reception. It was emphatically praised by the reviewers, and its sale was so rapid that the publishers could hardly produce it, in its successive editions, fast enough to meet the demand. But before the series of Dr. Lightfoot's articles was even approaching completion, the book was already a glut in the second-hand market.'[40] This story would not be worth repeating merely as an illustration of the exposure of a sciolist. The intrinsic value of the essays was such that Lightfoot was persuaded years afterwards to republish them in a volume, and this task engaged much of his time during his last illness at Bournemouth. The essays on the 'Silence of Eusebius' and 'The Ignatian Epistles' have lost none of their value in the intervening years, but one essay received striking confirmation in time for Lightfoot to mention this in his final revision. His adversary, in his desire to disparage the evidential value of second-century Christian writers, had denied the existence of one book often mentioned by early writers, but believed to have long vanished from sight. The story belongs to Lightfoot's career, but it has a sequel that deserves to be recorded here.

One of the claims of Christian scholars has always been that the four Gospels were widely accepted by the middle of the second century, and in support of this assertion they cited the witness of many Christian writers of early date that a certain Tatian made a harmony of the four Gospels to which he gave the Greek

[40] *Lightfoot of Durham*, pp. 9 f. (Cambridge University Press, 1932).

name *Diatessaron* (i.e. 'by means of four'). This Tatian was an Assyrian by birth, who was converted to Christianity by reading the Scriptures. While at Rome he became in some sense a disciple of Justin Martyr. Later on he went to the East, and adopted one of the heresies that abounded in that age. The author of *Supernatural Religion* denied that Tatian's *Diatessaron* had ever existed. Lightfoot brought forward cogent arguments in support of the traditional belief about Tatian's Harmony of the Four Gospels. But the *Diatessaron* he could not produce. When, however, during his last illness he was preparing his *Essays on Supernatural Religion* for republication in book form, he added a footnote to the last chapter. It seems that the actual *Diatessaron* of Tatian had since been discovered, though not in the Greek. The Syrian father Ephraem, who died in A.D. 373, had written a commentary upon this work in Syriac. An Armenian translation of that commentary, together with other works of Ephraem, had been published in Venice as far back as 1836. Lightfoot writes: 'I had for some years possessed a copy of this work in four volumes, and the thought had more than once crossed my mind that possibly it might throw light on Ephraem's mode of dealing with the Gospels, as I knew that it contained notes on St. Paul's Epistles or some portion of them. I did not, however, then possess sufficient knowledge of Armenian to sift its contents, but I hoped to investigate the matter when I had mastered enough of the language'.[41] Meanwhile, a Latin translation of this Armenian work

[41] *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, pp. 287 f. (London, 1889).

was issued, then an Arabic translation of the *Diatessaron* itself was discovered and published in Rome. Thus the ancient tradition about Tatian's work was proved to the hilt. Since Lightfoot's death nearly sixty years ago, the *Diatessaron* has turned up in Latin, in which, unfortunately, the text has been assimilated to the Latin Vulgate, and this in turn has left its mark on some medieval Dutch Harmonies of the Gospels. Was it possible that a copy of the supposed Greek original still survived anywhere in the world? It was because of rumours that such a Greek *Diatessaron* had been seen that that venerable scholar, the late Dr. Rendel Harris, set forth some twenty-five years ago on his last journey to the East, and visited once more the monastery on Mount Sinai. But he returned without finding the treasure. Then on 16th May 1934 immense interest was stirred by a letter in *The Times* over the signature of Professor Kirsopp Lake, who announced the discovery of a small fragment of a book, written in Greek, which could be no other than the *Diatessaron*. The fragment was described as a small piece of papyrus roll, discovered in the ruins of Dura on the Euphrates, 'in a position which precludes the possibility of its being later than the year A.D. 235, and makes a date of approximately 235 extremely probable'. The day after this letter appeared, Professor Burkitt wrote to *The Times*. At the close of his letter he said: 'The Greek *Diatessaron* had hitherto seemed to be a conjecture, and until the text of the new fragment is in our hands we cannot altogether reject the possibility that it is a re-translation from Syriac. Even in that case the discovery

is of the greatest interest, and may throw some light on the genesis of the *Diatessaron* itself. The main question about the *Diatessaron* is whether we should regard it as the last attempt to make a new Gospel, or as the first attempt to translate the Canonical Four.' How Lightfoot would have rejoiced to see that day! [42]

It was announced, on 28th January 1879, that Professor Lightfoot had been appointed Bishop of Durham. His great reputation as a biblical scholar and historian of the Early Church, and the powerful impression made by his sermons under the dome of St. Paul's, ensured a universal chorus of approval. Yet there were not wanting those who said that there were not a few churchmen who might make effective bishops, but there was only one Professor Lightfoot. With whatever misgivings, as he thought of his quiet rooms in Trinity, he accepted this great opportunity as a call to wider service. The story of his eleven years' episcopate in that industrial diocese is a remarkable record of spiritual and administrative achievement. He speedily won the hearts of business magnates and miners alike in that rapidly developing colliery area. New churches and mission-halls were built and con-

[42] See *A Greek Fragment of Tatian's Diatessaron from Dura*, edited with Facsimile, Transcription, and Introduction by Carl H. Kraeling (in *Studies and Documents*, edited by Kirsopp and Silva Lake, III, London, 1935). A few days before this lecture was delivered, I had the privilege of seeing this precious fragment, and the reconstructed Christian chapel (excavated quite close to the spot where the *Diatessaron* fragment was found) in the Archæological Museum of Yale University, under the guidance of Professor Kraeling himself. American students have here a good opportunity of studying the close connexion between archæology, textual criticism, and Church history in the field of New Testament studies.

secrated in parish after parish, and the Bishop preached sermons on those occasions which told the people the story of the old Northumbrian Church and its missionary heroes from the Celtic North and West, as well as its scholars and statesmen of a later period. Some of these sermons were afterwards published in the volume *Leaders in the Northern Church.* Yet all the while, by scrupulous economy of time, research and writing went on. The Bishop used the spacious episcopal residence at Auckland Castle as a training school for Oxford and Cambridge graduates who were preparing for the ministry of the Anglican Church. With the help of two chaplains, he guided their studies and lectured to them on the Greek Testament, or Patristics or Church History. Meanwhile, the three great volumes on Ignatius and Polycarp were going through the Press, and the new two-volume edition on Clement of Rome was being written to replace the original one volume with its supplement.

Stories are told of summer vacations spent in Norway when the Bishop was correcting proofs of these massive volumes. One of his 'Sons of the House' (as he called his pupils) recalls this scene. 'I was driving the Bishop in a *stolkjar* along a rough road near the Romsdal Horn when he wished to cross from one valley to another. After a few miles the road became so narrow with rocks on one side, and a sheer drop into the lake on the other, that I said to him: "I wish you would climb out at the back of the vehicle, there is only about four inches to spare on the near side." The Bishop looked down the precipice, and after a moment's

pause remarked, "Other stolkjars must have taken this road. Drive on"—and continued to correct proofs which he had that morning received.'[43] On another occasion, when they were staying at Oban, they hired a small open boat and went for a sail. As they were entering the Straits, at the south of the Island of Kerrera, a violent squall struck them. 'Had the sheet been fast', the narrator tells us, 'we should have been swamped; but it was let go in time and, tumbling about in the choppy sea, we got the sail down and reefed it. The picture of the Bishop, with the MS. of his *Ignatius* in his hand, quite calm and self-possessed, seemed to me characteristic.'[44] Even more astonishing than his coolness in danger is the fact that Lightfoot was correcting proofs in a situation in which reference to books was out of the question. The fact is that during those years of close and accurate study at Cambridge he had so mastered the details even of the texts of the early Christian writers that his retentive memory enabled him to dispense with works of reference when once he had written a chapter of one of his books. He wrote with great speed, without referring to books, but now and again with a reminder in the margin to verify a quotation made from memory. It was this powerful grasp of the literature of three centuries of early Christian history that enabled him to see things as a whole, and to write with the mastery of the perfect scholar. Lightfoot's early death robbed us of that complete critical edition of the Apostolic Fathers which he had in view. What would we not give to have his

[43] *Lightfoot of Durham*, p. 45. [44] ibid., p. 44.

introduction and commentary for Barnabas, the Didache, and the Shepherd of Hermas! We may also wonder whether, if length of days had been granted to him, Lightfoot could have found time amidst all his diocesan labours to write that 'History of the Church in the Fourth Century' which was one of his earlier dreams. We can form some idea of what it would have been by reading his masterly essay on Eusebius in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography.*

The death of Lightfoot at the close of 1889 broke up that triumvirate which had planned as far back as 1860 a Commentary on the New Testament. The three friends fully agreed on the general principles. The New Testament was to be interpreted as any other book with loyal obedience to the strictest rules of criticism, to the most exact scholarship, and to the frankest historical inquiry. The eldest, who also survived by some years both of his friends, has indicated the characteristic differences between them in the application of these principles. 'One looked primarily to the vivid realization of the original meaning of the text, another to the determination of the elements of philosophical theology which it contained, another to the correspondence of different parts of the apostolic records which suggest the fullness of the vital harmony by which they are united.'[45] There can be no doubt who is meant by each of these descriptive phrases. Lightfoot's clear, historic method is named first. The philosophic theologian is the one who left the smallest legacy of published work,

[45] *The First Epistle of St. Peter, I.1–II.17*, by F. J. A. Hort (London, 1898). Prefatory Note by B. F. Westcott, pp. vii f.

but whose every precious fragment published since his death is prized by those students of the New Testament who have any sense of true values.

FENTON JOHN ANTHONY HORT (1828–92) came up to Cambridge from Rugby, where he had been under Dr. Thomas Arnold and after his death under J. C. Tait, afterwards the famous Archbishop of Canterbury. At Trinity he read classics under Westcott, and Lightfoot also was one of his friends. His astonishing versatility is shown by his taking a first class, not only in the classical tripos, but also in the newly established triposes of moral and natural science. Although his life was devoted supremely to theological research, he was constantly asked to examine at Cambridge for honours degrees in philosophy and science. In 1852 Hort was elected a Fellow of Trinity, and resided there till his marriage in 1857, when, according to the statutes then still in force, he had to resign his Fellowship. He had already taken priest's orders, and now accepted a living in the gift of his college, St. Ippolyts, in Hertfordshire. In this country parish he lived and faithfully fulfilled his pastoral duties for fifteen years. How simply this great scholar could adapt his style to his rural parishioners can be seen in his *Village Sermons*, published after his death.

Outwardly, Hort's life is the most uneventful of the three. He never came before the public eye. His immense learning was known to a few scholars, but a wider sphere of influence was opened up when Emmanuel College elected him to a fellowship and a lectureship in Divinity. He returned to Cambridge in

1872, where six years later he was elected to the Hulsean Professorship of Divinity. His lectures must have been very different from those of his friend Lightfoot. For him there was no crowd of eager undergraduates. A small room would easily hold the select company of discerning scholars who packed their notebooks with the treasures that he handed out. He would lecture on 1 Peter, and at the end of a year, five or six verses might have been covered. But what a deep mine of gold had been opened to their gaze! At his death two books stood to his credit, one a slender volume containing two dissertations, the other the great critical edition of the Greek Testament, upon which he had been engaged with Westcott for thirty years. The volume of Introduction which set forth the principles upon which the text was based, while representing the joint work of the two editors, was actually written by Hort. This was the first really scientific text of the Greek New Testament which had ever been produced. If today textual critics are no longer so confident that Westcott and Hort's reliance upon the two greatest uncial MSS. as the oldest form of the text can be justified, that is largely due to the discovery of fresh material since 1881. The Sinaitic Syriac palimpsest of the Gospels found by Mrs. Lewis ten years later, the further study of the Old Latin texts, the knowledge of the Washington Codex bought in this century by Mr. Freer, the recovery of the Koridethi Codex, and a number of important finds of papyrus texts of various parts of the New Testament, have led to some modifications of the theory of the two Cambridge scholars.

But the Westcott and Hort Greek Testament is a monument of learned and judicial research, from which all later developments can be studied with impartiality.

Within a week of the publication of this text, the Revised Version of the New Testament appeared. It was soon evident that the Revisers had made continual use of the text provided by these two members of the Committee. Unfortunately, in a number of cases the readings which they sponsored were relegated to the margin under the unfortunate rule that a two-thirds majority must be obtained for any change in reading. The method of counting heads instead of weighing them is responsible for a far too tender regard in 1881 for the Textus Receptus which lay behind the text translated in the Authorized Version of 1611.

The *Life and Letters* by his son, Sir Arthur Hort, offers in two volumes a worthy portrait of this scholar with his many-sided interests. Like Lightfoot in his earlier manhood, Hort was a keen Alpine climber, and in his later years he spent many vacations in the High Alps, where he could indulge his lifelong zeal for botany. The letters reveal Dr. Hort's views on men and events throughout his whole career.

When Hort died on 30th November 1892, those who knew him mourned, not only for a great and good man, but also for the wealth of learning that died with him. Like Lord Acton a few years later in the same University, he died leaving little in print to compare with the great books that he might have written but for the extremely high standard of perfection which he set

before himself. Twenty years before, he had delivered the Hulsean Lectures on *The Way, the Truth, and the Life*. All that time the first two lectures had been in print, the third was printed from a MS. that had been rewritten, and the fourth from the original MS. Within a year of his death this remarkable book was published, with Notes and Illustrations added from the note-books which Hort had used in his preparation. This book shows, as nothing else that he wrote, what great powers he possessed as a philosophical theologian. Within a few years several books appeared, printed from the MSS. of courses of lectures that Hort had given, first as Hulsean and then as Lady Margaret Professor. Such were *Judaistic Christianity*, *The Christian Ecclesia*, *Prolegomena to Romans and Ephesians*. There were also six popular lectures on the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*. The diligence of disciples who had taken full notes at his lectures made it possible to expand his MS. notes of courses on various epistles, and so those priceless fragments of commentaries on 1 Peter, James, and the first three chapters of Revelation were preserved from oblivion. Yet it is not quite correct to say that Hort left little in the way of published writings. He contributed many valuable articles to the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, no less than seventy in the first volume under A and B, mostly on Gnostic writers. Above all, he inspired a younger generation of Cambridge scholars to devote themselves to research, never influencing their judgement or impressing his own solution of problems upon them, but telling them where to find the material by means of an

exhaustive list of references, and then leaving them to reach their own conclusions.

Brooke Foss Westcott (1825–1901) was the eldest of the trio, and he survived both his friends by several years. His writings covered a far wider range and his life was more diversified. After ordination in 1851 he went to Harrow, and for eighteen years endured the drudgery of a schoolmaster's life, for which, apart from his extraordinarily fine scholarship, he was not fitted. He not only assisted the head master by taking the sixth form in Latin and Greek composition, but he had a form of his own, and was master of a large house, with all the administrative work this entailed. He was a poor disciplinarian and therefore not completely successful as a teacher, yet by working far into the night he kept up a constant flow of scholarly books. He had a large family of seven sons and three daughters to support and educate, and for this reason probably kept to what must have been an uncongenial waste of his great powers. In 1869 Bishop Magee appointed him to a residentiary canonry at Peterborough, where he was in his true element. The following year the Regius Professorship of Divinity fell vacant at Cambridge. Had Lightfoot wished for it, he would have been appointed, but he stood aside that Westcott might have full scope for his ability and energy. He at once took the lead in the much-needed reform of the Divinity Faculty and the entire programme of examinations in theology. When Hort heard of the election, he wrote to F. D. Maurice: 'The news is so great, I hardly dare think of it. If Westcott

has but life and strength given him, I cannot but think this will be the beginning of a new time for Cambridge.'[46]

In addition to all this reorganization of the Faculty, Westcott lectured on Church History as well as on the New Testament. In due course his three great commentaries were published, that on the Gospel according to St. John in the *Speaker's Commentary*, afterwards issued as a separate volume,[47] that on the Epistle to the Hebrews, and later still that on the Epistles of St. John. There was a mystical strain in Westcott which found the Johannine world of thought specially congenial, and his strong sympathy with Origen and the Alexandrian theology fitted him in a peculiar degree to expound the Epistle to the Hebrews. The close condensation of thought so that every sentence is an epigram attracts some readers but repels others. Professor Nairne, in his book on Hebrews in the *Cambridge Greek Testament*, pronounces Westcott's as the greatest of modern commentaries on that epistle. Of Westcott's own interpretations he remarks: 'The longer they are dwelt upon the more right they are apt to prove themselves. What may seem at first too subtle turns out to be sympathetic with the author's habit of thought, and when the reader disagrees with some passage, he is likely to find on further meditation that his own idea has been included and transcended in West-

[46] *Life and Letters of Fenton J. A. Hort*, ii, p. 143.

[47] In 1882. A revised edition, based on the Greek text, was largely prepared by Bishop Westcott, edited by his son Arthur, and published in two volumes (London, John Murray, 1908).

cott's more complete perception.'[48] In such dissertations as the three in his commentary on the Epistles of St. John, 'The Two Empires: the Church and the World', 'The Gospel of Creation', and 'The Relation of Christianity to Art', we can discern that sense of the vital harmony of religion and life which makes itself felt in the long stream of books that poured from Westcott's eager mind to the end of his life. The titles of several, *The Incarnation and Common Life*, *Christus Consummator*, *Social Aspects of Christianity*, suggest the wide vision of the Christian Gospel which inspired all his public teaching.

We have seen that when Westcott was elected to the Regius Professorship he was already a Canon of Peterborough, and his period of residence was fitted in to the summer vacation. A few years later he resigned this canonry, but shortly after was nominated to a canonry at Westminster Abbey. His love of architecture, his historical imagination, and his earnest desire to awaken the English Church to a sense of its national responsibility, made this canonry an opportunity after his own heart. But a still more challenging call was to reach him. Lightfoot's death in 1889 had left a void, and who was worthy to fill his place in the ancient and influential northern see? As this was a Crown appointment, made on the recommendation of the Prime Minister, two strong wills came into collision. Those best able to judge knew that there was one man supremely fitted to take up the work so nobly carried

[48] *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, edited by A. Nairne, in the *C.G.T.* p. lxxi (Cambridge, 1917).

on by Bishop Lightfoot. Readers of *The Letters of Queen Victoria* are aware of the tussle that took place. Her Majesty, suitably coached by Archbishop Benson, the Dean of Windsor (so well known in after years as Archbishop Davidson), and Dr. Vaughan (later Dean of Llandaff), urged the appointment of Canon Westcott. The Marquess of Salisbury objected. 'He is a man of prodigious learning, and as a student most admirable. But I understand that he is a man of little personal influence, unimpressive, a bad presence, no hold over other men. As a learned man he would be thrown away, as Lightfoot was thrown away. His time would be occupied in the petty details of diocesan administration; and his unequalled erudition would become useless to the world for want of leisure to produce it.'[49] Very different was the judgement of his old friend Benson. 'Eminently marked out for Durham—Bishop Lightfoot's friend, full of his spirit; ready to take up all threads of progressive work in that northern population; learned, and with a University to care for; not really "crotchety" in *practical* matters, but businesslike; and keen in social questions.'[50] The Queen was sometimes obstinate; on this occasion she was commendably firm, with the moral support of those best qualified to advise her. So to Durham Westcott went. And what a triumphant bishopric it was! He captured all hearts. Those Durham miners knew that he was a great scholar, and they respected his learning. He was the founder and first President of the Christian Social Union of the

[49] *The Letters of Queen Victoria*, 3rd Series, I, p. 558.
[50] ibid., p. 555.

Church of England. His deep interest in all questions that concerned the daily life of the people was speedily recognized throughout the diocese. His personal influence over men of the most diverse type was soon apparent to the whole country. In the winter of 1892 the Durham coalfield was paralysed by a disastrous strike. All attempts at conciliation had failed. The colliery owners were unyielding, the men were obdurate. Hunger, wretchedness, unemployment, with the prospect of embittered relations for years to come, haunted the people. The new Bishop had been scarcely two years amongst them, but he stepped bravely in where others could see no hope of conciliation. He made tentative advances to the leaders on both sides of the dispute, and finally they accepted an invitation to meet at Auckland Castle, the Bishop's residence. The two groups assembled in separate rooms, and the Bishop went from one group to the other as intermediary. At last terms of settlement were agreed upon by both parties, and the terrible strike came to an end. As someone has said: '"He edited the Greek New Testament: he settled the Coal Strike". Where is the scholar whose epitaph might include two such items as its most typical features?'[51]

To some minds it may seem a paradox that two of the leading scholars of their generation should have proved in quite different ways two of the most successful diocesan bishops of the century. Neither of them had ever had any experience of parochial work, yet each

[51] J. H. Moulton, *The Christian Religion in the Study and the Street*, p. 97 (London, The Epworth Press, 1918).

of them won the complete confidence of his clergy and laymen from the start, and inspired the whole diocese with his spirit.

Meanwhile, what of the loss that Cambridge suffered? For two years after Westcott's departure Hort was the undisputed leader in the Faculty of Theology, but his strength was fast ebbing away, and on a brilliant winter's day Westcott stood beside the open grave of his friend. 'Some of those present, who now saw him gazing, as it were alone, after the coffin of his friend, recalled the occasion when in like manner but a short while before he and Hort had stood side by side looking into Lightfoot's grave.'[52] More than eight years were to pass before Westcott's body was laid to rest near Lightfoot's in Auckland Chapel. But the age of the great triumvirate at Cambridge was over. Their successors did work of a high order which was recognized in other lands. They had learned to neglect no detail, to read everything that had been written about a subject on which they wished to write, but not to surrender their independence of judgement. One of the most distinguished of them, Dean Armitage Robinson, pays his tribute: 'We began to write as soon as we could, and we learned by writing. But we never ceased to be conscious how inferior was the breed of the "Epigoni", inferior in intellectual vigour and in power of concentration, but inferior above all in that intensity of moral and religious conviction which makes the worker so much greater than his work.'[53]

[52] *The Life and Letters of Fenton J. A. Hort*, ii, p. 457.
[53] *Lightfoot of Durham*, p. 135.

After more than half a century, it is possible to see their work in a truer perspective, for it is obvious that new facts emerge and some questions receive a different answer in the light of further investigation. Thus in the region of the critical study of the Gospels the Synoptic problem had scarcely risen above the horizon when Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* was written in 1860. Hort, it is true, was for years hoping to produce a synopsis of the Gospels, and his interest in the subject appears in a letter to Lightfoot written in that very year. But somewhere about thirty years later, when Armitage Robinson asked him which of the many Germans he ought to read in making a beginning in the Synoptic problem, Hort's reply was: 'I should advise you to take your New Testament and form your own opinion first.' Above all, the Johannine problem has passed beyond the stage at which the Cambridge Three left it. No doubt they emphasized factors in the situation which have been dismissed too lightly by many later critics, but we are not likely to return to the position which they held so confidently. On those subjects which lie beyond the strict limits of theology, but which so profoundly affect our ultimate view of the universe, Hort's mind was most deeply engaged. It is said that he was not satisfied with Lightfoot's brief treatment of the first part of *Supernatural Religion* dealing with the miraculous element in the Gospels. But Lightfoot was right. His strength lay in historical research, and he therefore deliberately confined his attention to attacks made upon the Christian writings of the first two centuries. We could wish that

Hort had written a great book setting forth the philosophy of the Christian religion, for Professor Sanday regarded Hort as the greatest theologian of the nineteenth century.[54] His reputation rests less upon what he published than upon the extraordinary impression which he left upon those who knew him best. Westcott's reputation has suffered from two comments which hardly deserved to be recorded. The first was a clever jest, the other a hasty *obiter dictum*. Canon Liddon is credited with the jocular remark to a friend when London was enveloped in a fog: 'Canon Westcott has evidently opened his study window at Westminster.' Actually, fog is the last word to apply to Westcott. The worst that can be said is that sometimes in reading him we find ourselves in a luminous mist, with the sun just breaking through. Perhaps the book which shows him at his best is the volume of collected essays, *Religious Thought in the West*. But it may be said with confidence that in book after book he taught two generations that the doctrine of the Incarnation gives a new interpretation to the principle of solidarity and is the key to the social significance of our religion. Canon Sanday, shortly before his death, read a paper to members of the Churchmen's Union, in which he compared the work of Edwin Hatch with that of various English scholars, notably that of the great Cambridge triumvirate, and dropped the unfortunate remark that Westcott 'dabbled in fundamentals'. This has often been quoted without the sequel. A fortnight later, on the last walk that he ever took, Sanday told his com-

[54] *Dictionary of National Biography*, 1st Supp., ii, p. 446.

panion, Professor Walter Lock, with contrition, that he had been unjust to the author of *The Gospel of the Resurrection*.[55]

We can picture the three friends from their portraits and descriptions given by their contemporaries and disciples. Lightfoot, massive in build and of a heavy countenance, the very embodiment of masculine virility and sober common sense. One of the 'Sons of the House' has written: 'As is well known, Lightfoot had no beauty of face or form, but he had a most gorgeous smile, and when this came, it lit up his face like a glory and made it fine.'[56] The strong affection felt for him by all his young ordinands is the most revealing point in *Lightfoot of Durham*.

Hort's shyness and reticence made him less approachable. Dr. H. E. Ryle, afterwards Bishop of Winchester and Dean of Westminster, gives this description in his sketch of Hort in the *Dictionary of National Biography*: 'In appearance, as the writer recalls him between 1875 and 1892, Hort was one of the most striking-looking men among the more distinguished personages of the University. He was of middle height; he had the slight stoop of an indefatigable reader; his hair and close-cut beard, moustache, and whiskers were prematurely white. He had well-cut features, with a strikingly fine and broad forehead.'

No one who ever saw Westcott can forget his appearance, his noble head, and wonderful face. Dr. Lewis Muirhead wrote: 'In November 1887 I marked

[55] *Journal of Theological Studies*, xxii (1921), p. 104.
[56] *Lightfoot of Durham*, p. 47.

Westcott's rapt face among the worshippers in the chancel of King's College, Cambridge. No one had prepared me for the spectacle, but my guide to the place informed me after the service that what had struck me laid a habitual spell on some of the worshippers.'[57] Professor J. H. Moulton, the son of his old friend and fellow-Reviser of the New Testament, has placed on record his mental picture of Westcott. 'One could not help watching him whenever he was in view; there was always something to repay observation, like a mountain panorama over which the clouds and the mist and the sunlight bring perpetual change of beauty. The far-away look of contemplation would be succeeded by the eager glance of lively interest as the swift mind came back suddenly to some topic of serious conversation. Or the drawn features and look of pain, as he dwelt on the sorrows and sins of men, so real to him, would be chased away by that wonderful smile, a smile the like of which I never saw and never expect to see.'[58] The same writer describes a scene in a Cambridge lecture-room when the Regius Professor was lecturing in theology. At the back of the room was a group of unintelligent louts, who had to attend in order to secure a certificate with a view to bishops' requirements at ordination. Incapable of following the lecture, they played cards or read novels, trusting to some more intelligent friend's notes to copy for the purpose of examination. 'Once Westcott stopped abruptly in his lecture and fixed the back bench with wrath in his eye.

[57] *Expositor*, IX, i (April 1924), p. 245.
[58] *The Christian Religion in the Study and the Street*, p. 100.

Gathering up his gown, he strode down to the door, and presently we saw a big undergraduate towering above the little Professor and looking about as thoroughly withered as a man could do. In a minute or two the door opened, the hopes of a certificate vanished sullenly down the stairs, the Professor came back to his desk, and we resumed our note-taking.'[59] In Arthur Westcott's *Life* of his father, he gives one instance of the Bishop's righteous wrath that led the son ever after to believe in the story that Edward the First once killed a man by looking at him.[60] These incidents may help us to understand that phrase in the Apocalypse of John, 'the wrath of the Lamb'.

[59] ibid., p. 99.

[60] *The Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott*, by Arthur Westcott, i, p. 351 (London, 1903).

Four

Discoverers of Ancient Manuscripts and Recoverers of Early Christian Writings

THE public imagination was deeply stirred a few years ago by the transfer from Leningrad to the British Museum of one of the oldest existing manuscripts of the Greek Bible. Less sensational announcements which were made in the Press during the years immediately before the war excited the interest of all who care for the history of the sacred text. At the same time several recent obituaries have recalled to memory the services of scholars whose startling discoveries of unknown or long-forgotten treasures of Christian antiquity deserve to be retold to a generation that has never heard the story.

The mention of the Sinaitic Codex suggests the name of the most intrepid and successful adventurer in the search for ancient manuscripts. CONSTANTINE TISCHENDORF's story reads like a romance.[61] Born in 1815, he was only twenty-five when, after taking his degree in Theology at Leipzig, he started off to search the libraries of Europe for any biblical MSS. He had

[61] *Codex Sinaiticus: Tischendorf's Story and Argument Related by Himself* (English Translation, 8th ed., London, 1934). See further Sir Frederic Kenyon's valuable series of books: *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (2nd ed., London, 1912); *Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible* (Oxford, 1933); *The Text of the Greek Bible* (London, 1937); *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts* (4th ed., London, 1939).

already produced the first edition of his critical text of the New Testament, but decided that a far wider and more thorough examination of existing MSS. was needed. A letter of recommendation from his own University to the Government of Saxony secured him a meagre grant of about fifteen pounds in English money, half of which was spent before he reached Paris. Here he gave two years to exploring the libraries, with visits also to England and Holland. But his first success was gained at Paris, where an ancient codex of the Greek Bible had defied all attempts to recover the original text. It was a palimpsest, that is to say, the parchment had been used originally for one purpose, and then later on that writing had been washed and pumiced to receive a fresh writing as though it had not been used before. This Paris codex, known by the symbol C, was a copy of the Greek Bible written in the fifth century, and retouched in the sixth and the ninth centuries. Then in the twelfth century the script was erased and the parchment was used for a Greek translation of some works by a Syrian Father named Ephraem. Two famous textual scholars, Wetstein and Griesbach, had tried in vain to decipher the almost obliterated script. The French Government had allowed an unsuccessful attempt to revive the faded characters by the use of a powerful reagent. The young German scholar succeeded almost completely where all others had failed, and Tischendorf was now assured of influential support in pursuing his quest. He spent some time at Basle, travelled through southern France, and searched the libraries of Florence, Venice, Modena,

Milan, Verona, and Turin. Then in April 1844 he sailed for Egypt and the Coptic monasteries in the Libyan desert, then pressed on to Mount Sinai, Jerusalem, the convent of St. Saba near the Dead Sea, Nazareth, and returned by way of Smyrna, Patmos, Beyrout, Constantinople, Athens, Vienna, and Munich. Within nine months all these libraries had been searched for spoil. It was in the convent of St. Catherine, beneath Mount Sinai, that he struck the trail which was long years afterwards to result in his crowning achievement. Let Tischendorf tell us the story in his own words. 'I perceived in the middle of the great hall a large and wide basket full of old parchments; and the librarian, who was a man of information, told me that two heaps of papers like these, mouldered by time, had already been committed to the flames. What was my surprise to find amid this heap of papers a considerable number of sheets of a copy of the Old Testament in Greek, which seemed to me to be one of the most ancient that I had ever seen. The authorities of the convent allowed me to possess myself of a third of these parchments, or about forty-three sheets, all the more readily as they were destined for the fire. But I could not get them to yield up possession of the remainder. The too lively satisfaction which I had displayed had aroused their suspicions as to the value of this manuscript. I transcribed a page of the text of Isaiah and Jeremiah, and enjoined on the monks to take religious care of all such remains which might fall in their way.'

In return for his expenses Tischendorf handed over to the Government of Saxony a collection of Oriental

manuscripts, and in the library of the University of Leipzig deposited the precious Sinaitic fragments, together with fifty manuscripts he had collected during his tour. His mind continually reverted to this mysterious manuscript, and he used the offices of a friend in the service of the Viceroy of Egypt to negotiate for the missing portions. But by this time the monks were on the alert. Not only had Tischendorf quickened their interest, but other visitors seem to have confirmed their belief that they held in their possession a valuable treasure. Porphyrius Uspenski stayed at the monastery the year after Tischendorf's visit, and saw the part of the manuscript which was not shown to the earlier visitor, but he also found two leaves of the manuscript (containing extracts from Genesis and Numbers) in the bindings of some other manuscripts. It is also thought that a Major Macdonald in 1848 may have seen the precious codex. In 1853 Tischendorf made his second expedition to Mount Sinai, and found many rare biblical manuscripts, but apart from a little fragment containing eleven short lines of Genesis, he saw no trace of the missing treasure. All the time this indefatigable scholar was at work. He had brought out a sumptuous facsimile edition of his Sinaitic fragments of the Septuagint 'in which each letter and stroke was exactly reproduced by the aid of lithography'; he had edited the best manuscript of the Latin Vulgate (the Codex Amiatinus), also the Codex Claromontanus, an interesting bilingual Greek and Latin manuscript of the Pauline Epistles; he had produced an edition of the Greek Old Testament, and also seven editions of his

text of the New Testament. At length, in 1859, he made his third visit to Mount Sinai, fortified with a recommendation by the Tsar of Russia, the titular head and patron of the Orthodox Church. He was warmly welcomed and allowed to work in the library, but could find no trace of the manuscript he wanted. At last, on the evening before his departure, he was conversing with the steward about the Septuagint, when this man said, 'And I, too, have read a Septuagint', and then took down from a corner of the room a bulky volume wrapped in a red cloth. When Tischendorf took off the cover he saw to his astonishment and delight not only the remaining leaves which he had found in the basket fifteen years before, but other parts of the Old Testament and the entire New Testament, together with the *Epistle of Barnabas* and the *Shepherd of Hermas*. With a nonchalant air he asked permission to take it with him to his bedroom to look over it at leisure. We must again quote his own words. 'There by myself I could give way to the transport of joy which I felt. I knew that I held in my hand the most precious biblical treasure in existence—a document whose age and importance exceeded that of all the manuscripts which I had ever examined during twenty years' study of the subject. . . . Though my lamp was dim and the night cold, I sat down at once to transcribe the *Epistle of Barnabas*. For two centuries search has been made in vain for the original Greek of the first part of this Epistle, which has only been known through a very faulty Latin translation.'

We can well imagine the excitement of that night's

work; but anyone who tries to copy by hand the *Epistle of Barnabas* from a well-printed text will marvel how one man under such conditions could reproduce within one night the text of the entire Epistle from an ancient manuscript. That, however, was not the greatest of Tischendorf's achievements at Mount Sinai. We must not linger over the story of the way in which he hurried to Cairo, where the superior of the monastery had just gone, persuaded him to send an express messenger to fetch the manuscript to Cairo to be copied, of how Tischendorf himself with two assistants transcribed within two months a hundred and ten thousand lines, many of them faded or obscure through later corrections, of how in return for valuable services done for the monastery Tischendorf was allowed to take the Sinaitic Bible to Petersburg to have it copied as accurately as possible.

The Tsar commissioned Tischendorf to issue a facsimile edition. So he took the manuscript to Leipzig, where he had special type cut to imitate the script, and after three years a facsimile copy of the Codex Sinaiticus in four handsome volumes was presented to the Tsar, who had liberally provided for the cost. In 1869, in return for a large sum of money and the conferment of some special privileges upon the monastery, the Codex was presented to the Tsar. At the revolution of 1917 the Soviet rulers took over the royal possessions, and in 1933 it was bought for the British nation at a cost of £100,000.

Tischendorf's greatest discovery is one of the two oldest and most beautifully written of all our extant

uncial manuscripts of the Greek Bible. It has already been said that these ancient codices were gone over by later correctors, who noted variations from other manuscripts to which they had access. The Codex Sinaiticus can be dated not earlier than the time of Eusebius, because in the Gospels it has in red ink the Eusebian section numbers, which that scholar used in his ingenious tables for indicating the parallel passages in his harmony of the Gospels. But it was probably written about the time of the death of Eusebius, A.D. 340.

Wherever and whenever it was written, we know that it was at Cæsarea some time between the fifth and the seventh centuries, when several correctors went carefully through it. There is an extraordinarily interesting note entered by one of these correctors at the end of the book of Esther. It must be cited in full to gather its significance. 'Collated with an exceedingly ancient copy which was corrected by the hand of the holy martyr Pamphilus; and at the end of the same ancient book, which began with the first book of Kings and ended with Esther, there is some such subscription as this in the hand of the same martyr: "Taken and corrected from the Hexapla of Origen corrected by himself. Antoninus the Confessor collated it; I, Pamphilus, corrected the volume in prison through the great favour and enlargement of God; and if it may be said without offence, it is not easy to find a copy comparable to this copy."'

What an apostolic succession is suggested here! As we stand in front of the case in the British Museum and look at this beautiful copy of the Greek Bible written

in four columns to the page, we are in the presence of a book that was actually in existence about the time of the last years of Eusebius. But centuries afterwards it was placed side by side with a still older copy of part of the Old Testament, which had passed through the hands of the heroic martyr Pamphilus, the honoured master after whom Eusebius called himself. And the corrections in that more ancient copy were made by Pamphilus while in prison, and his corrections were made from a copy of the Hexapla which Origen, who died in 254, had himself corrected. So two of the names upon which we dwelt in our first lecture leap to life again as we gaze at the Greek Bible, which is so strangely bound up with the adventures of Constantine Tischendorf.

The other of our two oldest Greek Bibles in anything like complete form is the Codex Vaticanus. This has been known to rest in the Vatican library since its earliest catalogue was made in 1475. This most valuable of all our great codices was almost inaccessible, and as two editions of it by Cardinal Mai published in 1857 and 1859 were contradictory in so many readings, Tischendorf went to Rome in 1866 and sought permission to examine various passages. Permission was granted reluctantly, and on the stipulation that only these particular passages were to be consulted, and that work was to be limited to three hours a day for fourteen days. When it was discovered that Tischendorf had copied twenty pages in full, he was ignominiously stopped and the manuscript removed from his sight. However, he had made good use of his time, and he was able in 1867 to produce an edition of Codex B (as

it is called) which supplied fuller information about its readings than had been available till then. In the last edition of his text of the Greek Testament (1869–72), based as it was upon the Sinaitic Codex, good use was made of readings from the Vatican Codex.

The mere enumeration of Tischendorf's textual labours is astounding. He discovered eighteen uncial MSS. and six cursives, he edited twenty-five fragmentary uncials for the first time, and re-edited eleven in addition, and he transcribed with his own hand four and collated thirteen. In addition to all this, he produced editions of apocryphal Gospels, Acts, and Apocalypses as well as a Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek. No wonder he died, worn out prematurely, at the age of fifty-nine. But in that short life he did more than any other man has ever done to excite an interest in the discovery of lost Christian manuscripts.

James Rendel Harris (1852–1941) was a true successor to Tischendorf in his tireless pursuit for the recovery of the lost, but though he travelled much and thrice at least searched the famous library beneath Mount Sinai, and brought back manuscripts from the East, many of the clues which he followed so adventurously called for journeys into the past rather than into distant lands in the present.

Born in 1852 at Plymouth, he went up from the Grammar School of his native town with a mathematical scholarship to Clare College, Cambridge, and was third wrangler in 1874. The next year he gained a fellowship at his college, married in 1880, and remained at Cambridge until 1882. In that year he was

invited to a chair of New Testament Greek at Johns Hopkins University, that comparatively new foundation with a brilliant staff of professors, alluring by scholarships the most promising men from all over the States, who before long were holding professorships and lectureships at the leading American universities. After three years, Rendel Harris, who had become a member of the Society of Friends during his years at Cambridge, accepted a call to the chair of Biblical Languages at Haverford College, Pennsylvania. It was probably at this time that he began his study of Aramaic and Syriac with the help of a brilliant young colleague, who a few years later came to Drew Theological Seminary as Professor of Semitic Languages and brought great honour to this school of the prophets, the famous Robert William Rogers. By this time Rendel Harris had discovered his true bent. His first discovery was made in 1889 during a stay of fifteen days at the convent of St. Catherine, where Tischendorf had found his greatest treasure a generation earlier. Professor Palmer had visited this convent in 1868 and recorded in his book, *The Desert of the Exodus*, that he had seen 'amongst a pile of patristic and other works of no great age or interest . . . some curious old Syriac books, and one or two palimpsests'.[62] This hint was to put Rendel Harris and a friend of his on the track of two discoveries of outstanding interest. These are the stories.

Eusebius, whose *Ecclesiastical History* written in the

[62] *The Four Gospels Translated from the Syriac of the Sinaitic Palimpsest*, by A. S. Lewis, p. xi (London, 1894).

early part of the fourth century is our great repository for information about early Christian writings, tells us that amongst the earliest of the defences on behalf of the Christians presented to the Roman Emperors was one made by an Athenian philosopher, named Aristides, to the Emperor Hadrian. The Apology of Aristides, however, had completely vanished from sight. In the latter part of the nineteenth century an Armenian translation of what was believed to be the opening chapters of this lost Apology was discovered and published by the Armenian monks of the Lazarist monastery at Venice. Then Dr. Rendel Harris, during his first visit to Mount Sinai, came upon the Apology in a Syriac translation. He prepared an English translation with notes upon the Syriac text, together with an introduction. Dr. Armitage Robinson, as editor of the Cambridge Texts and Studies, in which series this translation was to appear, had read the proof sheets before going to the Continent to carry on research in some of the great European libraries. While looking in vain for a lost manuscript in a library at Vienna, he chanced to be reading a Latin translation of the *Life of Barlaam and Josaphat*. We may imagine his astonishment when he suddenly found himself reading words which were an unmistakable echo of the translation from the Syriac Apology of Aristides which he had been reading only a short time before. He immediately turned up the Greek of *Barlaam and Josaphat*, and there he found what must surely be the actual words of the original Apology. On returning to Cambridge Dr. Robinson compared the text which Dr. Harris had

copied in the Syriac at Mount Sinai with the famous speech in *Barlaam and Josaphat*, and the substantial identity was proved beyond a doubt.

But, it may be asked, how could so serious a theological treatise find its way into the most popular romance of the Middle Ages? Those who are acquainted with the recent application of source criticism to that fine novel *John Inglesant* will not find the question so hard to answer. As it is possible that some present have not read the story of *Barlaam and Josaphat*, I may be allowed to say a few words by way of explanation. It is an old romance, written probably in the fifth or sixth century, in which the Indian legend of the Buddha is worked up, and a number of Eastern stories are introduced into a narrative with a Christian setting and moral. Before the thirteenth century it had been translated into almost every known language in the world, including Icelandic. The narrative is as follows: an Eastern king persecuted the Christians and expelled the monks from India. When he was advanced in years and childless, a young prince, Josaphat, was born. The astrologers predicted that this prince would achieve greatness, but would become a Christian. To prevent this, the king screened him all through boyhood and youth from any contact with sorrow, disease, and death, and above all from Christianity. At long last the prince induced his father to give him freedom, but as he drove from the palace every effort was made to prepare the course so that his eyes might rest upon no evil thing. One day, however, he saw a lame man, and a blind man, and another day a wrinkled and totter-

ing old man. When he learnt that accidents may befall any man and that old age and death await us all, his soul was clouded with sorrow. Hearing of this, a Christian monk, Barlaam by name, came to him in the guise of a merchant to show him a goodly pearl. With many an Oriental apologue, interwoven with Gospel parables, the stranger convinced Josaphat of the Christian hope of the life to come, and the prince was baptized. The father was frenzied with grief when he heard this, and resorted to a stratagem to unsettle the young convert's faith in Christ. A clever actor, who resembled Barlaam, was to defend the cause of Christianity in open debate. But he was to set forth the Christian case so feebly that the rhetoricians would cover it with ridicule, and Josaphat would renounce his new allegiance. When the pseudo-Barlaam, Nachor, appeared on the appointed day, Josaphat warned him of a terrible doom if he failed to win his cause. This threat must have upset the resolution of the schemer, and like Balaam, he who came to curse, or at least to damn by faint argument, pleaded with such eloquence and force that Nachor himself was convinced by his own pleading, and the king was converted, as finally were all the people. Then in due course Josaphat succeeded to his father's throne, but later on resigned his kingdom and retired with Barlaam to a life of contemplation in the desert. Such is the story. How did the novelist succeed in providing Nachor with a speech that might be expected to produce so astonishing a result? By plagiarism of the most unblushing sort. He stole the Apology of Aristides and put it almost ver-

batim into Nachor's mouth. Perhaps there are times when the end justifies the means! At any rate, very many Christians for some centuries took their powder in the jam, and, let us hope, in their Sunday afternoon enjoyment of the religious novel read through, without skipping, the noble argument first addressed in the second century by the Apologist Aristides to the Emperor Hadrian. We owe it to the ingenious novelist that the original Greek of the famous Apology has survived to the present day.[63]

The major part in this sensational discovery was played by Rendel Harris. In the next discovery he played a secondary role. It was probably under his influence that two remarkable ladies living in Cambridge devoted themselves to the study of Semitic languages. They were twin sisters, both widowed, Agnes Smith Lewis and Mary Dunlop Gibson. Mrs. Lewis had studied Aramaic and Syriac, while Mrs. Gibson devoted herself to Arabic. Fired by Rendel Harris's story of his find in the convent at Mount Sinai, and stimulated by Dr. Palmer's hint about some Syriac palimpsests which he had not had time to examine, these intrepid ladies resolved to make the hazardous journey across the desert to visit the monastery of St. Catherine. By this time the monks had persuaded themselves that

[63] See Cambridge Texts and Studies, I, i, *The Apology of Aristides*, edited and translated by J. Rendel Harris, with an Appendix by J. Armitage Robinson (Cambridge, 1891). *St. John Damascene: Barlaam and Joasaph*, Greek Text with an introduction and English translation by G. R. Woodward and H. Mattingly, in the Loeb Classical Library (London and New York, 1914). The latest study is by Robert Lee Wolff in *Harvard Theol. Rev.*, 'The Apology of Aristides—A Re-examination' (xxx, pp. 233 ff.), and 'Barlaam and Joasaph' (xxxii, pp. 131 ff.).

their predecessors had been robbed of a treasure by Tischendorf, ignoring the scandalous carelessness with which the great codex had been treated before his first visit. But Rendel Harris had disarmed their prejudice against European treasure-hunters, and his friends were well treated. Amongst other manuscripts they were allowed to examine was a thick volume whose pages had not been turned for centuries. It was a palimpsest in which the upper writing was an entertaining account of the lives of women saints bearing a date in the eighth century. Mrs. Lewis observed at once that the lower writing was a copy of the Gospels in Syriac. She and her sister took photographs which were shown on their return to Mr. (afterwards Professor) F. C. Burkitt. He and Professor Bensly, on examining one page with minute care, declared that this was a copy of the earliest form of the Syriac version of the Gospels. It should be explained that, until fifty years before this time, the Peshitta, that is, the Authorized Version of the Syriac New Testament, was the oldest text in that language. But Dr. Cureton had shown that a Syriac manuscript brought with many others from a monastery in the Nitrian desert to the British Museum in 1842 represented an earlier form of the Syriac version. This type of text was now suspected to have another and more complete representative in the Sinaitic palimpsest.

In 1893 an expedition was formed to accompany Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson on a longer visit to the convent of St. Catherine. Dr. Rendel Harris had just returned to Cambridge as University lecturer in

Palæography. He and his wife, Professor Bensly and his wife, and Mr. Burkitt made up the party. They spent forty days there, and after applying a reagent (hydro-sulphate of ammonia) to bring out the lower writing, took careful photographs of the entire manuscript. Professor Bensly was taken ill on the return journey and died soon after reaching home. But this valuable authority for the earliest form of the Syriac text of the Gospels was edited and published by Burkitt and Rendel Harris in 1894.

This discovery greatly strengthened Dr. Harris in his opposition to the dominant school of New Testament textual criticism led by Westcott and Hort, who placed their greatest reliance upon the two earliest uncials, the Vatican and Sinaitic Codices. For some time past he had been deeply interested in the remarkable bilingual codex which had been presented by the Reformer Theodore Beza to the University of Cambridge in 1581. Apart from some curious additions in St. Luke, and even more in Acts, this codex of the Gospels and Acts finds support in many readings from the Old Latin version and Latin Fathers of the second and third centuries. In some of these readings support was not to be found in the Old Syriac. *A Study of the Codex Bezae* came out in 1891. Then followed *Four Lectures on the Western Text* in 1894, and the fascinating study leading down so many byways, *Annotators of Codex Bezae* (1901).

In 1909 Rendel Harris found among some Syriac MSS. (written on paper) that had been lying on his shelves for a couple of years a document of exceptional

interest. It was only of recent date, probably the fifteenth century, but a faithful copy of an early exemplar. It contained two books of quite separate origin. Part of it was a translation into Syriac of the so-called *Psalms of Solomon*, originally written in Hebrew in the middle of the first century B.C., but familiar to us in a Greek dress. It was probably contained in the Codex Alexandrinus, but was in the part that was lost before the famous codex came under examination. Many Greek MSS. of this work are extant, but the other portion of Rendel Harris's discovery was a book hitherto unknown, though the name is found in some ancient lists. The *Odes of Solomon* is a collection of forty-two old Syriac hymns, of which the first two are missing from this copy. Five of these Odes are preserved in Coptic in the extravagant Gnostic work called *Pistis Sophia*. The discoverer regarded these Odes as the work of a Jewish Christian. Archbishop J. H. Bernard, who also brought out an edition, looked upon them as Christian hymns recited by new converts before baptism. Others think that they are a Jewish composition interpolated by a Christian hand before the end of the first century. From the time of their publication until the outbreak of the First World War, when all such discussions were overshadowed by the contemporary tragedy, innumerable articles were appearing in learned journals and popular magazines about these Odes, and the discovery of this ancient hymn-book eclipsed in interest any other similar find for half a century past.[64]

[64] *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon, Now First Published from the Syriac Version*, by J. Rendel Harris (Cambridge, 1909). *The Odes of Solomon*, by

From 1903, when Dr. Harris left Cambridge and for a short time accepted the Professorship at Leyden left vacant by Van Manen's death, he lived in Birmingham, and was Director of Studies at Woodbrooke, the Quaker Settlement at Selly Oak. In 1916 he set sail for India to join his friend J. H. Moulton, who had gone out for a year to lecture on Zoroastrianism and to visit the Methodist missions throughout India and Ceylon. His ship was torpedoed, but he was rescued by a hospital ship and landed at Alexandria. He spent the winter in Egypt securing manuscripts for the Rylands Library, meeting his friend on his return from India. Again he fell a victim to German ruthlessness; the ship in which they were coming home was sunk, and of the six boats which made for the nearest land, only one survived that April blizzard in the Gulf of Lyons. Moulton perished of exposure, and Harris committed his body to the waves. After resting in Corsica till fit to travel, Rendel Harris came home, and for the next few years worked at Oriental manuscripts in Manchester for the Rylands Library.

His last important work on ancient literature was the recovery of early Christian *Testimonies*. Rendel Harris was impressed by a suggestion thrown out by Dr. Edwin Hatch that in their active propaganda the Jews would use collections of excerpts from the Old Testament as manuals of morals, devotion, and controversy. Hatch also hinted that the existence of composite

J. H. Bernard (Texts and Studies, VIII, iii, Cambridge, 1912). *Ein Psalmbuch aus dem ersten Jahrhundert*, aus dem Syrischen übersetzt von Johannes Flemming, bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Adolf Harnack (Leipzig, 1910).

quotations in the New Testament and in some of the early Fathers might be relics of such manuals. But Professor Burkitt, in his stimulating book. *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, published in 1906, made a further suggestion. It is known that Cyprian and others made use of such collections of excerpts from the Old Testament to prove to unbelieving Jews that in Jesus the prophecies of the Old Testament receive their fulfilment. Burkitt would identify such a primitive book of Christian Testimonies with the Logia of Matthew mentioned in the well-known statement by Papias quoted by Eusebius. Nothing could illustrate Rendel Harris's almost uncanny gift of following up a clue and linking together many apparently unconnected bits of evidence to form a feasible theory better than the two volumes, *Testimonies*, published in 1916 and 1920. In between these two parts appeared *The Origin of the Prologue to St. John's Gospel.* In this book the same line is followed of tracing the Sapiential titles of the Old Testament as applied to Christ, and the question is raised whether Jesus did call Himself Wisdom.

So far we have been thinking of the unresting energy with which this great explorer ransacked early Christian writings to discover some long-lost book, or to find a new approach to some problem in the New Testament. Yet there are many who hold that of all his numerous books those which show the rarest quality are a series of devotional studies in which an intimate knowledge of the Bible and of Christian hymnody, a wide range of literary allusion, and an unerring spiritual insight are intermingled with a subtle and

delicate humour. Surely of him it could be truly said, *Nihil tetigit nisi ornavit.* He had discovered the philosophers' stone, and could turn the most unpromising material into pure gold. What lure is there in *Aaron's Breastplate?* But the meditation which gives its title to that little book leaves one marvelling both at the writer's wizardry of words and the originality of his devotional instinct. So with *Memoranda Sacra*, *The Guiding Hand of God*, *Union with God*, *The Sufferings and the Glory*, and *As Pants the Hart.* He was at home in the inmost shrine of the sanctuary, but his spirituality and his irrepressible sense of humour were never disjoined. He was a man of strong prejudices and dislikes. At the same time his mind was strangely hospitable to thoughts and theories that might seem irreconcilably hostile to his deepest convictions. There were two strains in him. By ancestry and upbringing he was of the most militant Puritan stock. By conviction and deliberate choice he had become a Quaker. Some of his disciples will remember with a chuckle his reply to the question: 'Dr. Harris, what would you have done if you had lived three hundred years ago?' He stroked his beard for a moment and then said with that mischievous twinkle in his eyes: 'I should have fought with Cromwell's Ironsides at Naseby—and joined the Society of Friends *afterwards*!'

On his eightieth birthday a great company of friends gathered to do him honour at Woodbrooke, near which he spent the closing years of his long life. Tributes were read from every part of the world, and a sheaf of essays, contributed as a token of admiration for a

scholar of the highest distinction, was offered to him by the editor, Dr. H. G. Wood. A year later the volume, *Amicitiae Corolla*,[65] containing these essays was presented to him. One who was present at the birthday celebration can see him as he sat in the centre of that circle. The once stately figure was now bowed with the weight of years, but the noble head, crowned with white hair and framed in the flowing beard and whiskers and lit up by those expressive eyes, recalled the Rendel Harris, Christian rabbi and saint, who in his prime had gone to the relief of terrorized Armenians in the days of massacre and despair, who knew no national frontiers, and was hailed by scholars of many lands as a pioneer in several realms of study, who above all else knew the secret of the Lord and so spoke of the things that he had seen and heard that he could 'allure to brighter worlds and lead the way'.

A few weeks after his eighty-ninth birthday he passed beyond our sight.

There was one class of writing which constituted a whole literature in later Judaism and early Christianity. It is called Apocalyptic. Two supreme examples are Daniel in the Old Testament and the Revelation of John in the New. It is a major disaster that this part of the Bible has so largely been left to be the happy hunting-ground of the crank. It is unfortunate that these two books have so often been read in isolation. A flood of light has been shed on the Revelation of John by the discovery of so many other books of this class, so that the symbolism, the allusions, the strange

[65] *Amicitiae Corolla* (London University Press, 1933).

figures of speech, are seen in their relation to an imaginary world of thought. There came a time when these books, which were once so popular and so widely read in certain circles, fell into disfavour and came under the ban. Copies were destroyed, and many of the books vanished from sight. But there was one country where they survived in a strange tongue with which few outside its frontiers were acquainted. When the wave of Mohammedan invasion swept over western Asia and northern Africa, Christianity was almost blotted out from the map of that part of the world. But one island remained untouched by the devastating flood. In Abyssinia there was a Christian Church which owed its existence to Coptic missionaries from Egypt. Away there in those mountain fastnesses lived a people remote from the movements that were obliterating ancient landmarks elsewhere. Many writings had been translated into Ethiopic, the language of Abyssinia. These had been kept in monasteries through the long centuries, and books were to be found there which were little more than names in the rest of Christendom. To translate and annotate them was to be the achievement of one man more than anyone else.

R. H. CHARLES (1855–1931) was a Northern Irishman, born in county Tyrone. He was educated at Belfast, and then graduated at Trinity College, Dublin, where he took brilliant degrees. At the age of twenty-eight he was ordained, and spent six years as a curate in London. He then migrated to Oxford, was a member of Exeter, and then was given a Fellowship at Merton. He was appointed to a canonry

at Westminster in 1913, was made archdeacon two years later, and died in 1931. Those facts are the bare framework of his career in the Church of England. But behind this summary lies one of the most romantic stories in the history of biblical scholarship.

James Bruce the traveller made his way into Abyssinia, and in 1773 discovered two manuscripts of the *Book of Enoch*, a book that was known to Christian scholars merely from a quotation in the *Epistle of Jude* and from some extracts made by a Byzantine chronicler. He brought them home, but no modern version was made until Archbishop Lawrence's was published in 1838. The great German scholar Dillmann, who added a knowledge of Ethiopic to his wide Semitic scholarship, brought out a German edition with textual and explanatory notes in 1851. R. H. Charles became interested in this little-known subject, learned Ethiopic, hunted up manuscripts which had by now been recognized in various libraries, and after preparing an English critical edition, persuaded the Oxford University Press to publish it. This was an expensive venture, whilst at that time Charles was a comparatively unknown man, and the Delegates of the Press were relying upon his word alone that this was a genuine work of scholarship. The book was in the Press and on the eve of publication when the sensational announcement was made that an ancient manuscript had been found at Akhmim containing the first third of the Book of Enoch in Greek. It was not published for some time after this, and all that Charles could do was to write to the scholar who was in possession of this Greek

fragment to ask for a collation of certain passages where Charles had corrected Dillmann's text in the light of some other MSS. which he had examined. Meanwhile, it is easy to imagine the suspense with which he waited for the reply. Some thirty years ago Dr. Charles himself described to me the way in which the fateful message reached him. The letter came on a Sunday morning just as he was going out to conduct a service and to preach. He had no time to examine the letter before leaving home. For an hour or two he was torn with anxiety. But on his return he opened the letter and found to his intense joy that his edition was vindicated. The Oxford Press published his book in 1893, and thirteen years later he was able to bring out a new edition based upon twenty-three of the best surviving MSS. of the book. In rapid succession he produced editions of the little-known Jewish apocalypses. There was the *Book of Jubilees* (like Enoch also in Ethiopic), the *Apocalypse of Baruch*, the *Assumption of Moses*, the *Ascension of Isaiah*, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. He also wrote numerous articles on the Apocalyptic books for Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible* and for the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. But his greatest achievement was the editing of the two great volumes published by the Oxford Press, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*.

He gathered a fine team of scholars who edited the various writings, but some of the most important were done by Charles himself, and he exercised oversight all through. It is a vast and compend-

ious work, worthy of the best traditions of British scholarship and book production.

The risks of publication when so much must be left to the intuition of him who is moving about in territory with so few recognizable landmarks may be shown by two examples of Charles's adventurous work.[66] In 1896 he had published his recension of the text of the *Book of Jubilees*, and six years later was bringing out the commentary upon it. The commentary was based upon the assumption that the book was written from the point of view of a Pharisee in A.D. 1, and six sheets had already been printed when a fresh study of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* convinced him that this date was wrong, and that the *Book of Jubilees* was written a century earlier. He therefore asked the publishers to allow him to start afresh and base his commentary upon this new conception of its date and historical background. Such a change at such a stage requires great courage! The other story shows how even so great an authority in his own field can fall into error in spite of hints from those whose knowledge belongs to another region of study. A different book from *Enoch* (Ethiopic) is the *Book of the Secrets of Enoch*. This exists in Slavonic. Charles therefore secured the aid of Prof. W. R. Morfill to translate it into English. He then brought out an edition, in which he treated it as a Jewish composition written in Greek by an Alexandrian Jew before A.D. 70. M. R. James soon after pointed out that a crocodile-headed companion of the

[66] See Professor F. C. Burkitt's memorial notice of R. H. Charles in the *Proceedings of the British Academy*, xvii, p. 437.

sun which figures in Slavonic Enoch points to a different origin of that work. Moreover, Mrs. Maunder the astronomer showed that the astronomical allusions in this book could not consist with the Alexandrian theory of its provenance. Dr. J. K. Fotheringham then proved that it must be Byzantine, and is a Christian work of the seventh century. Unfortunately, Dr. Charles did not accept this correction, which is now generally seen to be beyond question, and when he edited the same book in the great Oxford Apocrypha referred to just now, the error was repeated, and therefore vitiates part of his treatment of this obscure book.

Such are the mischances to which a pioneer is liable. But what an amazing record for one man's life! Apart from those books already referred to, there are his editions of Daniel (1913), and the immense two-volume work on the Revelation of John in the *International Critical Commentary*. Anyone who wants to learn something about the intertestamental period and the bearing of these apocalyptic books on the thought of some parts of the New Testament can obtain that readable little book by Dr. Charles written for the Home University Library, *Between the Old and New Testaments*. No man has done so much to open up this whole field of literature as Archdeacon Charles.

He was the very antithesis of Dr. Rendel Harris. It was the contrast between the Plymouth Quaker and the Ulster Protestant. I shall always remember with gratitude the privilege of spending an afternoon with Dr. Charles in his lovely home in Little Cloisters, and then

a walk with him across St. James's Park on his way to the Athenæum. I can see him now, that short figure, so vital in every movement, his dark hair and short trimmed beard just turning grey, his dancing blue eyes, his impetuous utterance with the sentences unfinished as his rapid speech tried in vain to overtake the lightning-like speed of his thought. He was in a unique sense the master of that field of study which he had made his own.

Five

The Papyrologists

ON a July day in the year 1897, just over fifty years ago, a sensational announcement was made in the daily Press. Two young Oxford scholars, Messrs. Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, while digging in the rubbish-heaps at the long-buried city of Oxyrhynchus, on the edge of the Libyan desert, 120 miles south of Cairo, had come upon a scrap of papyrus containing some sayings of Jesus. In due course this was published in the first volume of the long series of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Meanwhile, a thin pamphlet was issued giving the text so far as it could be reconstructed, together with introduction and notes.[67]

This important fragment was a leaf from a papyrus book written in the third century. Of the seven sayings rescued from this book, of which the greater part had perished, several closely correspond to words familiar

[67] *Sayings of our Lord* from an Early Greek Papyrus, discovered and edited, with translation and commentary, by Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, with two plates. Published for the Egypt Exploration Fund by Henry Frowde, Amen Corner, London, E.C. (1897). After fifty years one can still feel the thrill of excitement with which a schoolboy bought this sixpenny pamphlet on the day when the daily Press announced its publication. Next in interest is the shilling pamphlet issued from the same house in 1904: *New Sayings of Jesus and Fragment of a Lost Gospel* from Oxyrhynchus, edited with translation and commentary by Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, with one plate and the text of the 'Logia' discovered in 1897.

to us from our canonical Gospels. One of them gave rise to a small library of exposition, and inspired one of the best known of the poems of Francis Thompson: 'Raise the stone and there thou shalt find me, cleave the wood and there am I.' Seven years later, in 1904, Drs. Grenfell and Hunt again startled us with the news of another fragment of Sayings of Jesus, which also they placed in the third century. Once more we find echoes of familiar words of our Lord. But in this collection there is one which was already known in part, because Clement of Alexandria quoted it as written in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*. 'Jesus saith, Let not him who seeks . . . cease until he finds, and when he finds he shall be astonished; astonished he shall reach the kingdom, and having reached the kingdom he shall rest.' Some of you may remember how a famous journalist of the last generation[68] based upon that text a discourse upon 'The Renascence of Wonder in Religion', which is quoted by Theodore Watts-Dunton in the preface to later editions of his novel *Aylwin*.

At the same time eight fragments of a papyrus roll containing a lost Gospel were found. This roll can be dated not later than the middle of the third century. It contains passages closely resembling sentences in the Sermon on the Mount, but also a saying very much like a known quotation from the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*. This was followed in 1908 by a fragment of an uncanonical Gospel, also found at Oxyrhynchus, but beyond showing an intimate knowledge of

[68] Sir William Robertson Nicoll.

Jewish ceremonies of purification in connexion with the Temple worship, it has little in it to interest us. There is even reason to believe that the local colour is due to the imagination of the author, writing towards the close of the second century. This fragment illustrates the way in which when the Four Gospels had attained complete and exclusive authority in the Church, a supply arose to meet the demand for something fresh.

There is no need to chronicle the discovery of many fragments, smaller or larger in size, which supply additional textual evidence for portions of various books of the New Testament. But three discoveries announced in the early thirties are of unusual significance. First came the purchase, by Mr. Chester Beatty from some dealers in Egypt, of a group of papyri which were probably found beneath the ruins of a Christian church or monastery. On examination they were found to contain portions of papyrus codices, that is, sheets of papyrus formed into quires, not rolls, and so presenting the appearance of a book. Various parts of the Old Testament are represented, and very considerable parts of the New Testament. Some of these were written late in the second century, some as late as the fourth, but the supreme value of the New Testament texts is that they take us back a century earlier than our oldest uncial manuscripts. The great credit for the editing of these priceless survivals of an early Christian century belongs to Sir Frederic Kenyon, and to Professor H. A. Sanders, of Michigan University.

Then in 1935 Dr. H. Idris Bell and Mr. T. C.

Skeat, both of the British Museum, published *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel*, which on palæographical grounds can be dated about the middle of the second century. The principal interest of this document is that it clearly draws upon each of the Four Gospels, while also bringing in apocryphal matter, thus proving that our canonical Gospels were all in circulation before this Gospel was written, which may well have been at some date considerably earlier than this mid-second-century copy. But the smallest yet the most remarkable of the three discoveries is a tiny fragment of what once must have been a codex of the Gospel according to St. John. This was acquired in Egypt by Dr. Grenfell in 1920 and sent to the Rylands Library in Manchester, where it was examined and edited by Dr. C. H. Roberts in 1935. Small as this fragment is, it contains on the one side part of verses 31–3 and on the other of verses 37–8 of Chapter 18. Expert palæographers date it with confidence in the first half of the second century. It is thus the earliest known fragment of the New Testament in any language.

It might well seem to most people who are interested in the story of the growth and transmission of the New Testament that such discoveries as these cover the connexion between the Bible and Papyrology. But that would be an erroneous conclusion. It is probable that few educated people had even heard of the papyri of Egypt before the excitement caused by the publication of the *Sayings of Our Lord* just half a century ago. Yet for over a century before that the subject had been alive.

Papyrus as a writing material can only be preserved

in a dry climate. It perishes quickly in a humid atmosphere. The only conditions under which papyrus documents have survived are excessive dryness of soil, or complete protection from atmospheric moisture. Those conditions were supplied by the sands of Egypt and by the hermetically sealed ruins of Herculaneum and Pompeii when overwhelmed by the lava and ashes of Vesuvius. That appalling disaster took place too early for the preservation of any Christian documents. Yet it was some rolls from Herculaneum that were unearthed and brought to this country in 1752 which began our long story. Next came the first Egyptian finds in 1778, when some Arabs digging in the Fayum district came upon some fifty rolls in a pot. As they could find no one willing to buy them, they burnt them, except for one roll, which fell into the hands of Cardinal Stefano Borgia. The older publications are those produced at Turin in 1826–7, at Leyden in 1843–85, at Paris in 1865, in London by the British Museum from 1893 onwards, at Dublin (the Flinders Petrie Papyri) from 1891, in Berlin from 1895. It would take too long to recite the names of all the universities and libraries which have published transcriptions and commentaries on collections which have passed into their possession, though honourable mention should be made of the work done by Professor E. J. Goodspeed of Chicago. Thousands of documents containing public accounts, official proclamations, legal forms, and private correspondence have thus been published, with the result that we know more about the political and municipal, the social and the home life of the Greek-

speaking population of Egypt under the Ptolemies and the Roman régime than we know of any people in the Ancient World. Moreover, from the papyri we have learnt more than was ever known before of the Greek Koinē, the Hellenistic Greek that was spoken by the people who lived in the world around the Mediterranean from the time of Alexander the Great till a time several centuries A.D. A pupil of Dr. Lightfoot's has published a note which he took down in a Cambridge lecture in 1863. Lightfoot was speaking of some New Testament word which had its only classical authority in the historian Herodotus, and said: 'You are not to suppose that the word had fallen out of use in the interval, only that it had not been used in the books which have come down to us; probably it had been part of the common speech all along. I will go farther, and say that if we could only recover letters that ordinary people wrote to each other without any thought of being literary, we should have the greatest possible help for the understanding of the language of the New Testament generally.'[69]

Thirty years after those words were spoken, a young German pastor at Marburg happened to be turning over the pages of a recent publication in the University Library at Heidelberg. It was the latest instalment of the *Berliner Griechische Urkunden*. Unlike most of the great editions of the Greek papyri from Egypt, the early volumes of the Berlin documents were not printed, but lithographed. The various scholars who transcribed and edited the documents copied out the

[69] See J. H. Moulton, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, ed. 2, i, p. 242.

Greek text by hand and appended their signatures. The indexes, which were added when the several parts were ready for binding, alone were printed. The young pastor, as he picked up one of these parts, noticed the signature of a friend. Before long his deeper interest was aroused, for he could not fail to observe how words and constructions which were familiar to him from his Greek Testament were meeting him on every page. This led him to a systematic study of the Greek papyri, which from that time were being discovered in ever-increasing quantities, then edited and published. The first-fruits of this new investigation appeared in two books, *Bibelstudien* (1895) and *Neue Bibelstudien* (1897), which were translated into English by Dr. Alexander Grieve and published in 1901 under the title *Bible Studies*. That book marks a new epoch in the study of the Greek Testament. Its author was Adolf Deissmann.

G. A. DEISSMANN, the son of a Lutheran pastor, was born at Langenscheid in Nassau in 1866, became a Privatdozent at Marburg in 1892, was a minister and at the same time lecturer in the Theological Seminary at Herborn from 1895 to 1897, when he was appointed Professor of the New Testament at Heidelberg. In 1908 he was called to the leading Chair of the New Testament in Germany, as successor to Bernhard Weiss at Berlin.

We have remarked that Deissmann's *Bible Studies* marked the beginning of a new era in New Testament exegesis. The purpose of the book is explained in its sub-title: 'Contributions chiefly from Papyri and

Inscriptions to the History of the Language, the Literature and the Religion of Hellenistic Judaism and Primitive Christianity.' Two main contentions in the book are (*a*) that the Septuagint is influenced by the Hebrew original which it translates, and also by the everyday use of words in the Greek spoken in Egypt, and (*b*) that in the New Testament we must distinguish between the genuine letter and the literary epistle. All through the book examples are given of the light thrown upon the vocabulary of the Greek Bible by the words found in the papyri and the inscriptions. The Hebrew idioms of the Septuagint gave rise to a 'written Semitic-Greek which no one ever spoke, far less used for literary purposes, either before or after'. Yet again and again the papyri explain the use of a Greek word in the Septuagint which has puzzled the commentators. Thus in Joel 1^{20} and Lamentations $3^{4\text{-}7}$ the Hebrew words for *water-brooks* and *rivers of water* are both translated by a Greek word which means *releases*. Now we have quite a number of papyrus documents from the Ptolemaic age which show that the phrase *to release the water* is the technical term for 'to open the sluices for irrigation', and the noun is often used in the corresponding sense. Thus we can see how the translators of Lamentations $3^{4\text{-}7}$ rendered by *release of waters* the Hebrew phrase for *streams of water*, breaking forth before the eyes of the people—'not indeed verbally, but on behalf of their own readers, by transferring into the Egyptian dialect the image which was so expressive for the Palestinians. Similarly, the distress of the land in Joel 1_{20} is made more vivid for the

Egyptians by the picture of the carefully collected water of the *canals* becoming dried up shortly after the opening of the sluices (*the releases of water were dried up*), than it would be by speaking of dried-up brooks'. This is an interesting example of what we might call the translators' relativity in the use of words. But Deissmann showed that this process of transmutation of ideas by words went much farther. His pamphlet, *The Hellenizing of Semitic Monotheism*, is a striking contribution to the study of the Septuagint as a *praeparatio evangelica* for the Christian mission in Greek-speaking lands. For this side of his work Deissmann acknowledged his debt to what at the time must have seemed a misfortune. When he began his linguistic study of the Greek Bible, Hatch and Redpath's Concordance to the LXX had only reached the first two or three letters of the alphabet. As he wished to examine the uses of the Greek preposition ἐν, he was obliged to read through the whole of the LXX to discover what he wanted. Thus he gained a knowledge of the Greek Old Testament which would probably never have been his but for the want of a concordance.

This research into the use of a Greek preposition resulted in a dissertation, *The New Testament Formula 'in Christ Jesus'*, which he published while a Privatdozent at Marburg in 1892. In this we find the germ of two of the ideas which were to attain such striking development in his later books. He was already discussing the question whether there was such a thing as 'Jewish-Greek', and he was already studying the importance of the Pauline formula for the mystic union

of the Christian with his Lord. Yet there is an immense gap between this pamphlet of 156 pages and the *Bibelstudien* of three years later. The LXX and the New Testament have been ransacked for examples, and considerable use is made of Greek literature, but there is no mention of the papyri. As we have seen, the opening up of this new vein of ore brought immense wealth to Deissmann's treatment of the language of the New Testament. He showed that the word used by St. Paul for his 'collection' for the saints at Jerusalem was not a new word coined by Paul, but was in common use in Egypt two centuries earlier. The use of the Greek word translated Elder as a technical term in Egypt for the holder of a communal office may suggest its early use for an official in the Primitive Church, especially as inscriptions prove that the same use is attested in Asia Minor. But it is also found as an official title of pagan priests, and in the papyri it shows a tendency toward this sense. The bearing of this lexical fact upon ecclesiastical history is evident. Another word received welcome light from contemporary usage, the *mark* of the Beast. The word so translated is the name of the imperial seal, giving the year and the name of the reigning emperor (possibly also his effigy), and found on bills of sale and similar documents of the first and second centuries. The apocalyptist has made a free use of this prototype. The number is at the same time symbolic and cryptogrammatic, and the imagery of the Beast is taken from ancient myth, as developed in apocalyptic. But the contemporary allusion is unmistakable.

The book by which Deissmann deserves to be remembered longest is his great work, *Light from the Ancient East*.[70] It is as fascinating as it is comprehensive. It opens up the whole field of investigation by means of inscriptions, papyri, and ostraca. It illustrates the gains to our study both of the grammar and of the vocabulary of the Greek Testament from these new sources. It illustrates both the literary and the non-literary portions of the New Testament. But, above all, the social and religious background of the Christian mission is illustrated with a wealth of information and of photographs. Almost every page bristles with points for the student of the New Testament and for the Christian preacher. Thus in Revelation 1[10] there is a note of challenge. The new texts have shown us that a particular day in every month received the name *Sebastē*, that is, 'Augustus Day'. The Christians, in their protest against the imperial cult, with its Emperor's Day, named the first day of every week, *Kyriakē*, the Lord's Day, in celebration of the triumph over death of Him who is King of kings and Lord of lords. Or let us turn from the Lord to those who are proud to call themselves His bondservants. There are two phrases in Galatians and one in 1 Corinthians which carry an allusion to the widespread institution of slavery, part of the very fabric of the social order of the world of St. Paul's day: 'For freedom did Christ set us free'; 'Ye were called for freedom'; 'Ye are not your own. Ye were bought with a price.' All these are formulæ

[70] *Licht vom Osten* (Tübingen, 1908, 4th ed., 1923). English translation, *Light from the Ancient East* (2nd ed., revised and enlarged, London, 1927).

regularly used in the legal process of the manumission of slaves. They are therefore used allusively by the Apostle to point the contrast between the slave's liberty purchased with his hard-earned savings and the Christian's freedom paid by Christ Himself 'with the redemption-money of his daily new self-sacrifice, rousing up *for freedom* those who languished in slavery.'

More popular and less technical are his later books, *Paul* and *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul.*[71] The former was written while the author was still under the spell that Eastern skies had thrown over him. He had sailed in a pilgrim steamer in the Levant, and had followed in the footsteps of St. Paul. Everywhere we feel the atmosphere of travel. The two principal thoughts are that Paul the missionary was an artisan, a man of the people, and that he was a mystic and not a theologian. These are unfortunate exaggerations of truths that need to be emphasized. The social status of Paul is not affected by the fact that his father followed a well-known rabbinic precept in seeing that his son was taught a craft. Unless Luke is quite unreliable, Paul had a status which commanded the respect of Roman proconsuls and military officers. But Deissmann did well to remind us of the free and unstudied style in which Paul dictated his letters. He can never be mistaken for a literary *poseur*. Deissmann rightly emphasized the religion rather than the theo-

[71] *Paulus* (1911, 2nd ed., 1925), English translation, *Paul; a Study in Social and Religious History* (London, 1912, 2nd ed., revised and enlarged, 1926). *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul* (London, 1923).

logy of the Apostle. But it may well be doubted whether he ever did full justice to the reasoned and coherent thought in the Apostle's teaching. For Deissmann Paul's religion is a Christian mysticism, explained by his experience of conversion. From that time all is summed up in the term 'in Christ'. Justification, reconciliation, forgiveness, redemption, adoption, are all metaphors used to describe this wonderful state of union with God in Christ.

A most interesting suggestion was thrown out in the Woodbrooke lectures and then incorporated in the later edition of his *Paul*. In German there are two words with widely differing meanings, *Mysticismus* and *Mystik*, which may both be translated into English by mysticism. But the former is depreciatory and the latter is used in both a narrower and in a wider sense. To remove misunderstanding, Deissmann distinguishes between acting and reacting mysticism. We can study mysticism by considering its varying types according to their origin or their results. When we investigate the origin, the decisive matter is the initiative. 'Who is it that gave in the first instance the impulse to the mystical movement of the soul? Man approaches God, or God approaches man. Mysticism of performance or mysticism of grace. Striving mysticism and mysticism of the divine gift.' Again, if we look at results, the aim of mysticism is either *unio* or *communio*, oneness with God or fellowship with God, either loss of the human personality in God or sanctification of the personality through the presence of God. One of the most illuminating passages in the second edition of *Paul* is

Deissmann's exposition of the Pauline mysticism as reacting and as *communio*. One has only to study fully the implications of Galatians 2^{20} to see how just is this description of the Pauline teaching on the great experience of union with Christ.

Two journeys to the East in 1906 and 1909 left a deep impression on the imagination of this German professor. Between the years 1926 and 1929 he took part in four campaigns of excavation on the site of Ephesus, and wrote a vivid account of these excavations in the *Biblical Review* for July 1930. He also travelled westwards, and paid several visits both to England and America. In two visits to England before the war of 1914–18 he became a close friend of Dr. J. H. Moulton, and was a keen worker for friendship between the two nations. But when war broke out, like Harnack, he defended the action of the aggressor with vigour and carried on a weekly news-letter which grossly misrepresented the action of the Allies, and repeated apocryphal stories of the ill-treatment of German missionaries while passing through Liverpool for repatriation. This stirred Moulton to vehement protests. But their friendship stood firm through all the strain of wartime. No one grieved more deeply over the tragedy of Moulton's death. When at last peace was restored, Deissmann flung himself with all his ardour into the work of reconciliation and did much to link up in personal correspondence scholars on both sides of the North Sea. He was one of the leaders in the Ecumenical Movement and took a prominent part in the conferences on Faith and Order. When Hitler rose

to power and the very word 'international' was a rock of offence, Deissmann, who had risen to high honour under the Weimar republic, fell into disfavour, and his last years were clouded by the political situation. But on 7th November 1936 his seventieth birthday was celebrated in Berlin. Ten years earlier his colleagues and former students had presented him in German fashion with a *Festschrift*.[72] This time the anniversary was kept in high festival. Letters and telegrams from friends, from learned societies, and from scholars all over the world, came pouring in all day in a ceaseless flood of congratulation. Books and flowers were showered upon him. Pictures and plants were sent to recall his beloved homes on the banks of the Lahn, the Rhine, and the Dill. The Press entered into the rivalry of felicitation. But the climax of the day's rejoicings was reached at an evening reception held in the house of his son Ernst in Berlin. Here two presentations were made on behalf of a committee of old students of Deissmann's. Professor Martin Dibelius unveiled a bronze bust of Adolf Deissmann, made by the Berlin sculptor, Gerhard Schliepstein. An album was then presented, containing the autograph greetings of about three hundred friends from many lands and Churches. How deeply his heart was moved by this demonstration of affection and respect is evident in every line of the printed letter which Deissmann sent to all the subscribers to this birthday celebration. It is now a happy memory that such honour was shown to one of the greatest biblical scholars, and one of the most effective

[72] *Festgabe für Adolf Deissmann zum 60 Geburtstag* (Tübingen, 1937).

promoters of international goodwill in this generation, before it was too late. For before April 1937 was half over this great Christian leader had been called home. He was thus spared the shame which deepened in the hearts of the best Germans as Nazidom went on from crime to crime. He was saved from the protracted agony of the Second World War.

Others have described Deissmann's appearance in his lecture-room at Heidelberg and in Berlin, or his influence in such ecumenical assemblies as those that met at Stockholm and Lausanne. My own personal memories are limited to a garden-party given in his honour by his friend Professor Moulton at Didsbury in the summer of 1913, to a number of meetings when Deissmann was lecturing at Woodbrooke during February and March 1923, and to a week-end at Berne at the opening of the second *Ost-westliche Theologen-konferenz*, held in that picturesque city at the beginning of September 1930. On that occasion Professor Deissmann and Archbishop Söderblom came on from a committee of the Faith and Order Conference which had just met at Mürren in order to give their blessing to this adventure in international biblical study and ecclesiastical fellowship. Whenever one was in his presence, he made an impression of gracious dignity. His bearing was that of a German savant. His tall, broad figure, his dome-like brow, his full black beard, gave a nobility to this appearance. Yet there was an entire absence of pomposity in his manner, and his kindliness in conversation had no touch of patronage.

Two memories of the twin series of Woodbrooke

lectures on 'The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul' stand out after a quarter of a century. After one of the Pauline lectures, when questions were invited, a long-winded fundamentalist got up to ventilate his views. The moment he began Dr. Deissmann rose and stood upright, listening with attentive courtesy to the rambling harangue. When at last the man sat down, the lecturer replied in most respectful tones: 'I think that was not a question.' The audience which had with difficulty repressed its annoyance with the bore was now convulsed with laughter at his discomfiture. Only Deissmann looked a little distressed at the thought that he might unwittingly have seemed rude.

After one of the lectures a lady asked a question about the cursing of the fig-tree. Deissmann asked to be allowed to give the answer the next time. The following week he made a statement which was a revelation of the man himself. It can be read in full in the book just named. He told how his mother had grown a fig-tree from a cutting. When she had to leave the house on the death of Adolf's father, she gave him the fig-tree, which was growing in a tub. He took it with him to Berlin, and every year in the middle of February he brought a twig of it to show to the students when discussing the parable of the fig-tree: 'When her branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is near.' Then one hard winter the tree was frozen. This was a sad event to Deissmann, for the tree reminded him of the happiest years of his youth. 'Since that time it has become to me even more difficult to accept that Jesus could have destroyed a fig-tree

simply because at a time when it could not have any fruit it did not have any.' He then sketched the three stages in the development of this tradition, in a way that will interest every reader of that delightful set of lectures. Such was the 'natural piety' of this great scholar.

If Deissmann was the pioneer in applying the yield of the papyri to the illumination of the New Testament, the two scholars who have done most to consolidate his lexical and grammatical discoveries and to carry on the research were two friends whose fathers had been friends and collaborators a generation earlier.

James Hope Moulton (1863–1917) and George Milligan (1860–1935) were both 'born in the purple', as their friend Professor Peake used to tell them. Professor J. H. Moulton's father was first head master of The Leys School at Cambridge. He was one of the original members of the New Testament Company of the Revisers of the Authorized Version of the Bible, and was one of a small but influential sub-committee consisting also of Westcott, Lightfoot, and Hort. After Lightfoot's removal to Durham, the remaining three used to meet in Dr. Moulton's study, and were responsible for the revision of Wisdom and 2 Maccabees. Dr. William Milligan was Professor of Biblical Criticism in the University of Aberdeen. Not only were W. Fiddian Moulton and William Milligan fellow-Revisers, they collaborated in writing an exposition of the Gospel according to St. John for Schaff's *Popular Commentary*. Years afterwards their sons were to be partners in another work which will make their

names as inseparable for New Testament scholars as are those of Liddell and Scott in the field of classical lexicography.

James Hope Moulton went with a classical scholarship from The Leys to King's College, where he won a brilliant First in both parts of the Classical Tripos, with special distinction in comparative philology, and was elected to a Fellowship at King's.

Under the inspiring teaching of Professor E. B. Cowell, the great Orientalist, he made a profound study of Indian languages, and in time won a reputation as a leading authority on the sacred books of Zoroastrianism. He followed his father in the ministry of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, and was his father's assistant as classical master. He lectured in the University on the subjects required for the second part of the Classical Tripos, and after his father's sudden death in 1898 inherited the great task of preparing a completely new edition of Winer's *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, which his father had translated with many additional notes years before. In 1902 he was appointed to the Chair of New Testament Language and Literature at Didsbury Theological College, Manchester, where he immediately made his influence felt as a lively and deeply devout expositor of Holy Scripture. It was at this time that he was writing his famous *Prolegomena*, the first volume of his New Testament Greek Grammar.[78] Those of us who had the privilege

[78] First ed., Edinburgh, 1906, 3rd ed. 1908. A revised 4th edition was translated into German, *Einleitung in die Sprache des Neuen Testaments* (Heidelberg, 1911). The second volume was edited and published in three parts, completed in 1929. (The third volume is in preparation.)

of sitting at his feet during the three years before its publication discovered, as his readers were then to find out, that James Moulton had the power of breathing life into the dry bones of grammar. At the same time those Lexical Notes on the Papyri were appearing in the *Expositor*, which were soon to become the joint production of the two friends. It is quite impossible to describe for those who were not present the raciness of his style. His classroom was never dull. Who can forget that ocular demonstration with the aid of a poker to distinguish between the various kinds of aorist? One never knew whether some gem in the text would be given a setting of fine gold extracted from some Egyptian rubbish-heap, or whether a passing reference would discover some intimate connexion between comparative religion and some half-forgotten nursery rhyme. For while far removed from his friend Sir James Frazer in religious convictions, he had acquired from him an absorbing interest in comparative folk-lore. In his lectures at the University he kept his versatility and his keen wit under severe restraint, but there also he drew largely upon his study of the papyri to illustrate both the grammar and the vocabulary of the texts which we were studying. By that time he had been appointed Greenwood Professor of Hellenistic Greek and Indo-European Philology at Manchester University, and took a vigorous part in the formation and development of the Divinity Faculty, while also lecturing under the Faculty of Arts.

It was the first instalment of his *Grammar* that set him in the forefront of the world's scholars. Professor

Albert Thumb, the first authority on the history of the Greek language in its entire extent, exclaimed: 'We have nothing to equal it in German.' The great Harnack pronounced Moulton to be our foremost expert in New Testament Greek. Deissmann wrote an enthusiastic review in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, in which he made the significant comment: 'Dr. Moulton is never wearisome.' A reviewer in the *Dublin Review* wrote that 'Dr. Moulton shares with Dr. Rendel Harris, among New Testament scholars, a certain irrepressible gaiety which from time to time relieves the dullness of optatives and aorists, or stichometrics and Syriac fragments, as the case may be'.

All this time Moulton was taking an active and often a militant interest in the public life of Manchester. He was a vigorous defender of the faith, organizing and sharing in a series of lectures on Christianity at a time when Robert Blatchford was captivating large numbers in the industrial North by an anti-Christian campaign in a popular weekly paper. He was an ardent supporter of the evangelistic and social work of the Manchester and Salford Mission, and he was an enthusiastic temperance reformer, often taking the platform with his friend and ally, Canon (afterwards Bishop) E. L. Hicks, the learned epigraphist.

As far back as 1902, Moulton's article on Zoroastrianism in Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible* proved his deep knowledge of the subject. Nine years later he wrote for the Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature a little book, *Early Religious Poetry of Persia*, and the following year delivered the Hibbert Lectures

in London and Oxford on *Early Zoroastrianism*. His reputation in this field of learned study was to have a fateful sequel. Meanwhile, he went to America, and to a vast popular audience at Northfield gave those fascinating lectures afterwards published with the title *From Egyptian Rubbish Heaps*, a book which tells in a way that the most unlearned can understand the vital interest to be found in the papyri, especially for a student of the Bible. It was while he was in America on this visit that the First World War broke out, and Moulton, lover of Germany and pacifist as he was, was compelled to modify the views of a lifetime as he heard almost with incredulity of the cynical contempt for solemn treaties and the barbarities with which a great nation trod under an iron heel a little nation whose neutrality it was pledged to protect. This was for him the beginning of the end. Within a year he was overwhelmed by the sudden death of his wife. At that moment a call came to spend a year in India, part of the time in lecturing on Zoroastrianism to its modern devotees, the Parsis of Bombay, part in visiting the mission-stations of that sub-continent and lecturing to British troops in various parts of India and Ceylon. He entered upon this new opportunity with zest, and the visit was extended to more than half of a second year. His elder son meanwhile had died in the fighting on the Somme. The voyage home was cheered from Port Said by the companionship of his dear friend Rendel Harris. They quoted the classics, they discussed ecclesiastical questions, they revelled in all the questions which divided them (for Moulton reverenced

the great Cambridge Three and Harris was in strong opposition); above all else, they communed much about the future life. Then came the tragedy. Their ship was sunk by repeated torpedo attack. A terrible April blizzard beat down upon their frail craft, the only one ever to reach shore. Moulton, working like a hero at the oar, though weak from illness and the strain of the Indian tour, succumbed, and his body was lowered into the sea. Only a day or two before he had with unconscious prophecy been reciting Lycidas from memory: 'Lycidas, your sorrow, is not dead, Sunk though he be beneath the watery floor.'

Two volumes were afterwards published as the harvest of those days in India, *The Teaching of Zarathushtra* and *The Treasure of the Magi*, thus bringing to completion his contribution to one of the three subjects in which he had gained an international reputation. The second volume of his *Grammar* was published in 1929, and about the same time the great work which he undertook with his friend was brought to a successful conclusion. Before telling that story, I may be allowed in a few words to describe Dr. James Moulton as I first remember him well over forty years ago. I can see him still, striding along with that elastic step, an athletic figure full of energy, pouring out to a companion in his walk his vehement views on political questions, or repeating with delighted admiration some fine saying of a great scholar. Then I can see him seated at his desk in that upper room at Didsbury College, expounding some passage from the New Testament with rare insight, his voice vibrant, and sometimes

even shrill, with emotion, but reverently lowered whenever he named the Name that is above every name.

GEORGE MILLIGAN spent almost his entire boyhood at Old Aberdeen in the pleasant surroundings of King's College. From the Gymnasium he passed on to Aberdeen University, where he gained a First in Classics, a Second in Philosophy, and the Hutton Prize for all-round scholarship. After spending some time in Italy as a travelling tutor, he returned to Aberdeen for a two-years' course at the Divinity Hall, which was followed by a year at Edinburgh. During a brilliant theological course, he spent vacations at Würzburg, Göttingen, and Bonn. His parish experience was gained at Morningside, Edinburgh, and in the country town of Caputh, Perthshire. Like so many other Scottish theologians, he found in a country manse, with a small parish to care for, an opportunity to lay the foundation for a monument of scholarly work. His great commentary on the Epistles to the Thessalonians issued from that manse in 1908. It showed to what excellent use he could put the material which he and his friend Moulton had been publishing for a year or two past in the *Expositor*. In 1914 he published the first part of that indispensable lexicon known as the Moulton-Milligan *Vocabulary of the New Testament illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-literary Sources*. Moulton had taken his full share in the writing of the second part, and much of the material to the end of the alphabet had been prepared by him, but between 1915 and 1929 the whole burden fell upon Milligan's shoulders, and

right gallantly did he toil on till the end was reached. In 1910 he was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism in Glasgow University. Three years later appeared his Croall Lectures, *The New Testament Documents*, an attractive approach to the study of the New Testament writings from a side that has often been neglected. His last book, *The New Testament and its Transmission* (1932), contains a course of popular lectures which must have made the elements of textual criticism a subject of interest to the general public. But Dr. Milligan's remarkable gift for investing an out-of-the-way subject with living interest is best displayed in *Selections from the Greek Papyri* (1910) and *Here and There among the Papyri* (1922). The former is a masterly introduction to papyrology for the student of the Greek Testament; the latter was written to show the general reader how much the papyri have done to throw light upon the life in Egypt and also upon the New Testament and early Christianity. Professor Milligan loved to tell the story of a dinner given in London in his honour just after his election as Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland the summer after this book appeared. Copies of the book were arranged on the table, festooned with ribbons mischievously representing the racing colours of Mr. B. Irish, whose horse Papyrus (ridden by S. Donoghue) had just won the Derby!

Dr. Milligan filled with distinction the Moderator's chair in the Church of Scotland in 1923, once more following his father's example after an interval of

forty-one years. Great as was his learning, he will be remembered not less for his charm of character and his constant readiness to help younger workers with guidance and encouragement. His generosity in spending time and trouble knew no bounds. He wore his learning lightly, in the meekness of wisdom, and won the love of all who knew him.

These three distinguished scholars have made available for the rest of us the discoveries which cost them a lifetime of diligent research. Out of the material long buried in the desert sand, most of it of no apparent use to anyone, they have selected the details which throw light on the language of the ordinary people, which is the tongue in which most of the New Testament was written. Manners, customs, allusions which would mean nothing to us, as we merely read the English translation of the New Testament, are charged with a new meaning when we read the Greek Testament and find ourselves able to listen to its reading with the ears and understanding of those who were the contemporaries of Luke and Peter and Paul, of Mark, and the many early missionaries who travelled to and fro in that Mediterranean world. Their language becomes alive again. It is the language of the man in the street, in the shop, on the boat, in the heathen temple, at the common meal of the craftsmen's guild. We can hear the Apostle Paul speaking in the street at Ephesus or Corinth, and now we listen with a fresh and lively interest, for Deissmann and the others have taken us into the world of that time, and taught us its dialect. Yet as the Apostle speaks, we find that his subject is

novel. It is about a revolution which has come into his life and that of many others. Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today, and for ever; but His wondrous acts must be told in the contemporary language of each succeeding age.

Six

William Mitchell Ramsay
Archæologist and Historian[74]

WITH the death of Sir William Ramsay at Bournemouth last April a notable career came to a close. He was in his eighty-ninth year. The obituary notice in *The Times* had a portrait of the old savant which must have surprised many readers. It shows a clean-shaven face, whereas the Ramsay who was known to so wide a circle of biblical students is well represented in the portrait which forms the frontispiece to *Anatolian Studies*. In this he wears a heavy moustache, close-clipped whiskers, and a short, pointed beard.

The main facts in his life-story may be briefly stated. Born at Glasgow on 15th March 1851, he was educated at Aberdeen Gymnasium and Aberdeen University. After a brilliant course, the young graduate went up to Oxford in 1873 with a scholarship at St. John's College. Here he distinguished himself by taking a First in Classical Moderations and a First in *Literæ Humaniores*. He pursued his studies in classical archæology at the University of Göttingen. In 1878 he married and took his wife to Athens, where they both studied Greek art and he applied himself to epigraphy. The following year he crossed to Smyrna, and it was in Asia

[74] Reprinted from *Religion in Life*, VIII (1939), pp. 580–90.

Minor that his most important work was done. While at Smyrna Ramsay was invited by Sir Charles Wilson to join him in a journey into the interior. Wilson had been appointed consul-general for Anatolia, and was commissioned to supervise the administrative reforms promised under the Treaty of Berlin, but he was also keenly interested in archæology, and his zeal for historical geography had been whetted by his service with the Palestine Survey. He was glad to encourage exploration, and Ramsay, helped by a travelling scholarship from Exeter College, Oxford, availed himself of this special advantage in studying the geography of Phrygia, Lycaonia, Cappadocia, and Galatia. On the recall of Wilson in 1882, Ramsay continued his investigations by means of an Exeter Fellowship and a fund raised by some leading Oxford scholars. In 1885 he became first Professor of Archæology at Oxford, but a year later was appointed to the chair of Humanity, as the Latin professorship is entitled, at his first University of Aberdeen. This post he held for the next twenty-five years, until he retired through ill health in 1911. All through these years he was a prolific writer, and he returned again and again to fresh exploration in Asia Minor. He was in great demand as a lecturer, and visited America to give the Morgan Lectures in Auburn Seminary in 1894, the Deems Lectures in New York University in 1910, and the James Sprunt Lectures at Union Theological Seminary at Richmond, Virginia, in 1913. Lectures given before Harvard University, Johns Hopkins University (the Levering Lectures), and Union Seminary, New York, were worked

up with the Morgan Lectures to form the volume, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*. He was knighted in 1906 on the occasion of the four hundredth anniversary of the University of Aberdeen. He had two sons (one of whom was killed at Neuve Chapelle) and four daughters. After the death of his first wife in 1927, he married again in 1928. His death came after some years of retirement, but for many years after his resignation of the Aberdeen professorship his pen was as busy as ever.

His writings fall into three classes, representing his work as an archæologist, as a biblical historian, and as a popular apologist.

I

His most enduring fame in the world of scholarship was gained in the field of archæology. In the year in which he first visited Asia Minor he began a series of some hundred contributions to the ninth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. From 1880 onwards his tireless pen wrote innumerable articles to the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* and to kindred journals in France, Germany, and America. The two books which contain the ripe harvest of these years spent with the spade and note-book are *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor* (supplementary papers, Royal Geographical Society, Vol. IV, London, John Murray, 1890) and *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, Vol. I (Oxford, Clarendon Press, Part I 1895, Part II 1897). This great volume, which was never followed up, had appeared in a rough

draft in two contributions to the *J.H.S.* in 1883 and 1887. Ramsay described it as 'an essay of the local history of Phrygia from the earliest times to the Turkish Conquest'. Those who turn to these earlier books will best understand the immense range of knowledge that lay behind his better-known books on New Testament subjects. No pains were spared that surveying, excavating, and epigraphic decipherment could offer for the recovery of ancient sites and for tracing the course of successive civilizations. Lacunæ in our knowledge of Hellenistic or Roman administration were filled in, and early Christian history in Asia Minor was traced in a way that had been impossible before.

To those who see the result of years of toil transcribed from crowded note-books to well-printed works of reference, the actual labour with all its thrills and bitter disappointments may remain a hidden chapter. How many readers have the slightest conception of the fatigues and fevers, the exposure to blazing sun and scorching wind, to drenching storms and flooded camps, of the miserable food and wretched transport, which such an intrepid traveller as Ramsay took for granted as part of his mission? Years afterward he told his colleague in a later expedition, Miss Gertrude Bell, that on the first journey he made in Asia Minor he found nothing at all. But she also recorded his excitement when she found a very queer inscription. The moment he looked at it he exclaimed: 'It's a Hittite inscription. This is the very thing I hoped to find here.'

In the preface to the second part of his *Cities and*

Bishoprics he tells the story of how he was unintentionally robbed of the fruits of one of his early expeditions. In 1883 Ramsay and M. Foucart, Director of the École Française d'Athènes, had, at the suggestion of the latter, drawn up a plan of operations. One of the two travellers sent out by M. Foucart fell suddenly ill, and the other, by pure inadvertence, followed the line marked out for Ramsay. The result was that for most of the first journey which began in May, Ramsay and his party found in many villages that a French traveller had been there a week or two before. To their chagrin, on arriving at Smyrna after a journey of ten weeks, they found the *Bulletin de Correspondence Hellénique* with an article containing the best set of inscriptions which they had discovered. In his irritation Ramsay wrote at once a letter to the *Academy* criticizing this article. This unfortunately led to sore feelings on the other side, and a letter which Ramsay was persuaded to send to a French journal, instead of allaying hostility, seemed to increase the bitterness. Nor was this the only misunderstanding which the young travelling scholar had to endure. The German scholar, Professor G. Hirschfeld, who had absurdly accused Ramsay of gross plagiarism, died just after the first part of *Cities and Bishoprics* had left the author's hands, before there was an opportunity of convincing him that he had no just grounds for his charges.

A glimpse of Ramsay in these earlier years is given in that attractive piece of autobiography by another great archæologist, D. G. Hogarth's *The Accidents of an Antiquary's Life*. The passage is too good to spoil by

abridgement or paraphrase. 'The apparatus of travel, which we gathered in Smyrna, was of the simplest—a single tent and a few pots and pans, but no canned stores; and two simple villagers were hired to serve us. The qualifications of the one chosen to cook became manifest on the second night in camp. We had left railhead at Seraikeuy, and ridden up the Lycus valley to the foot of the white cliffs of Hierapolis. Mehmet bought a turkey of the peasants of Pambuk Kalessi, and was bidden to have it ready for the next night's supper. Early on the morrow we went up to the site, and all that day, under a broiling sun and among some of the best-preserved Roman tombs in Asia Minor, I entered on an arduous apprenticeship to the best epigraphist in Europe. Sharpset at nightfall we hurried down, expectant of our turkey. Mehmet sat placid, the bird at his feet. It was a corpse, indeed, but no more, not even a plucked one. "What am I to do with this?" said Mehmet. He learned better as time went on; but throughout that journey we had little except sodden messes to eat, faring worse than any traveller need fare. It was partly because our leader cared little for what he ate, but more because, like his followers, he journeyed on a slender purse. Ramsay had made to himself a European reputation as an explorer of Asia Minor at a cost which another man would think scarcely sufficient for the tour of Germany; and it had become his principle, as, for similar reasons, it has become Petrie's, to suffer none but the barest means to his end. If both have pushed their practice to exceeding discomfort, both have taught several young Britons how little is

necessity and how much superfluity; and it is not the least of my many debts to Ramsay that I gained in my first tour of exploration the will and the capacity to go farther at less cost than perhaps anyone but my master.'[75]

This was in 1888. Years later we have another glimpse of him. That learned and fearless traveller, Miss Gertrude Bell, who was no respecter of persons, thus writes from Konia (Iconium) in 1905: 'The Consul and his wife met me at the station, and dined with me at the hotel. I found there Professor Ramsay, who knows more about this country than any other man, and we fell into each other's arms and made great friends.'[76] Two years later they were partners in a new adventure. Fifty or sixty miles south-east of Iconium there rises an island of volcanic mountains called Kara Dagh (Black Mountain). In a cultivated stretch of fertile soil at the northern foot of this range lay an ancient city, once large and prosperous. It was surrounded by outlying settlements, monasteries, and churches. The neighbouring people give this ruined city and its outposts the name of Bin Bir Kilisse, which means The Thousand and One Churches. The Oriental mind delights in fanciful exaggeration. There were actually about twenty-eight churches in the valley. Sir William Ramsay and Miss Bell agreed to explore these remains and publish the result of their researches in a book. Miss Bell writes in 1907: 'Sir William is to write the historic and epigraphic part, and I the

[75] pp. 5 f. (London: Macmillan, 1910).
[76] *Letters of Gertrude Bell*, i, p. 223 (London: Ernest Benn, 1927).

architectural.' 'I should have been helpless without Sir William, and the more I work with him, the more I like him and respect his knowledge.'[77] With the publication of *The Thousand and One Churches* Ramsay's purely archæological work may be said to have ended.

II

Long before this his fame had become established as one of the foremost historians of the Apostolic Age and of the relations between the Early Church and Roman imperial rule. An important series of books began in 1893 with *The Church in the Roman Empire Before A.D. 170*. This was followed by *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen* (1897), *A Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (1899), *Letters to the Seven Churches in Asia* (1904), and *The Cities of St. Paul* (1907). To this period also belong the numerous historico-geographical articles in the first four volumes of Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible*, together with the three valuable monographs that enriched the Extra Volume of that Dictionary in 1904. These dealt with 'Religion of Greece and Asia Minor', 'Roads and Travel in the New Testament', and 'Numbers, Hours, Years, and Dates'.

It was Ramsay's chief contention that to understand the epistles of Saint Paul, or the narrative of Acts, or the letters to the Seven Churches of Asia, it is first necessary to know the lie of the land, the atmosphere and outlook of the district concerned, and the social

[77] ibid., i, p. 239.

and political history of the people. Ancient literature and inscriptions play their part, but much can be learned only by travelling over the ground. He scarcely veiled his disdain for rapid visits by tourists, though in one of his essays he disavows contempt for 'those who sojourn in the tents of Cook'. In another place he declares that 'the modern traveller in a railway train never learns what the influence of scenery is'. A footnote adds: 'This section was written before Adolf Deissmann had performed the two train journeys which helped him to write his book on Saint Paul. . . . As an example of the distorting influence of knowledge acquired by a railway journey, I quote from page 18: "At the present day it would be possible on horseback and then with the railway, to get from Colossae to Laodicea, which is near Colossae, and back again in two days (13 and 15 March)." Such geographical remarks only darken the subject. One can do much better at home with a map.'

The first result of Ramsay's application of the historical method to New Testament studies was to convince the great majority of British and American scholars of the soundness of the South Galatian theory. This theory identifies the people of Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, the churches founded on Paul's first missionary journey, with those addressed by the Apostle in his Epistle to the Galatians. The theory was not original. It had been advocated in Germany a hundred years before by J. J. Schmidt, and from time to time by Mynster, Böttger, and Thiersch. Renan in France and Hausrath in Germany had popu-

larized the arguments used in its favour. Now Ramsay brought his unrivalled knowledge of the ancient history of Asia Minor to its support. His chief difficulty was to overcome the immense authority of Bishop Lightfoot, whose commentary on Galatians by the very strength of its historical method seemed to have settled the destination of that epistle. But Ramsay, with all his reverence for Lightfoot as a historian with a perfect mastery of material and method, argued that the commentary on Galatians was written in 1865, before the epigraphic material now available had been discovered. He was able to show that his own researches had led Lightfoot to modify his position on another subject, and in the last edition of his commentary on Colossians to withdraw a long discussion, substituting for it a footnote in which he acknowledged that Abercius was bishop, not of Hierapolis on the Maeander, but of Hierapolis near Synnada. Not without reason he claimed that had Lightfoot lived to study the latest archæological evidence from Anatolia, he would have shown the same candour in revising his commentary on Galatians.[78] After half a century it cannot be said that the question is *res judicata*. In the English-speaking world there are still a few supporters of the North Galatian theory, and German opinion has been fairly evenly divided.

Of more importance is the renewed interest which Ramsay gave to the study of Paul by his *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*. Many who have

[78] Lightfoot, *Colossians*, p. 54, n.1; *Apostolic Fathers*, I, ii, p. 494; Ramsay, *Hist. Comm. on Galatians*, p. 5.

devoted their lives to New Testament studies would say that their first eager interest in the Pauline writings was aroused by Lightfoot's *Galatians*, but that their enthusiasm for Paul the man was kindled by this never-to-be-forgotten book of Ramsay's. But it did more: it opened many eyes to the value of the Lucan narrative of the early Christian mission. We were enabled to see Paul the Christian missionary moving about in that Græco-Roman world. Both the man and the world in which he enjoyed his citizenship became real. The past came to life again and was vividly present. Further knowledge of the Hellenism which helped to shape the Apostle's later life was contributed by *The Cities of St. Paul*, especially in those chapters which describe Tarsus and its place in the teaching and practice of the Stoic philosophy of that age. No student of that book will ever again read the fourth chapter of Philippians with the same eyes as before. The Revelation of Saint John is the most difficult book in the New Testament. It raises problems which belong to the sphere of source-criticism, of comparative religious ideas, of translation Greek, of apocalyptic symbolism, which lay outside Ramsay's range of specialized knowledge. But his *Letters to the Seven Churches* made a permanent contribution to the study of the Apocalypse in two directions. The imperial cult as the background of persecution in proconsular Asia stands out with a vividness that provides the reader with a new understanding to interpret the book as a whole. Ramsay also draws on his ample stores of knowledge to show that behind every one of the seven letters in Chapters 2

and 3 there lies an intimate knowledge of the church addressed. For Ramsay contends (sometimes, it must be confessed, with an excess of imaginative zeal) that the character of each church has been affected by the history of the city in which it has its life. Subtle or open allusions are made to local circumstances or traditions. Thus Pergamum, the centre of the imperial cult, is the place 'where Satan's throne is'.

Before leaving this aspect of Ramsay's service to the interpretation of the New Testament, one example may be given of the treasure that lies buried in some of his less well-known works. For many years he poured out a ceaseless stream of articles into the *Expositor*, the *Interpreter*, the *Contemporary Review*, and other magazines. Some of these were enlarged from letters addressed to the *Academy* or the *Athenæum*. Later on, many of these were gathered into such portmanteau volumes as *Pauline and Other Studies* (1906), *Luke the Physician and Other Studies in the History of Religion* (1908), *The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day* (1913). In the last-named book there is a chapter about the relation of Saint Paul to the Greek Mysteries. This is an expansion of an essay in the *Contemporary Review* for August 1913 (the substance of which appeared in the *Athenæum* for 25th January 1913). Commentators had long been puzzled by the word *embateuein* in Colossians 2_{18}. Textual critics had done their best or their worst with the text. Ramsay called attention to a recently published inscription from the Sanctuary of Apollo of Klaros, which contained this very word, 'to enter upon', describing the performance

of some act or rite in the mystic ritual. This supplies the key to the passage, 'Let no one cozen you of the prize of your life-race, finding satisfaction in self-humiliation and worshipping of angels, "taking his stand on" what he has seen (in the Mysteries), vainly puffed up by his unspiritual mind, and not keeping firm hold on (Christ) the Head'. Saint Paul used this word because it was a technical term, and we can best bring this out by the use of inverted commas. 'Its effect', says Ramsay, 'depends on the fact that it was a religious term familiar to his Phrygian readers. They caught the sarcastic innuendo that a person who is alluded to had formerly "entered".' This theosophical leader in the Church was introducing ideas which he had brought over from his old belief in the Mysteries. Thus the entire passage (Colossians 2_{8-19}) is treated by Ramsay as a clear indication of Saint Paul's attitude to the Mysteries. It shows that the Apostle was opposed, not to philosophy itself, but to the kind of philosophers that he encountered; that he gave the outward ceremonial of the Mysteries credit for veiling philosophic thought and appealing to a certain religious feeling in mankind; but that whilst recognizing the good intention, he condemned them as absolutely wrong in their methods and views.

III

Sir William Ramsay, in his earlier writings, became an unwilling apologist. In his later years the apologetic motive became almost an obsession, and there is some

truth in Professor Kirsopp Lake's remark that in his later writings Ramsay 'scarcely admits the possibility of error in Acts on any point'.[79] The story of his surprising discovery of the historical value of Acts is told in the opening chapter of *St. Paul the Traveller*. 'I may fairly claim to have entered on this investigation without any prejudice in favour of the conclusion which I shall now attempt to justify to the reader. On the contrary, I began with a mind unfavourable to it, for the ingenuity and apparent completeness of the Tübingen theory had at that time quite convinced me. It did not lie then in my line of life to investigate the subject minutely; but more recently I found myself often brought in contact with the book of Acts as an authority for the topography, antiquities, and society of Asia Minor. It was gradually borne in upon me that in various details the narrative showed marvellous truth. In fact, beginning with the fixed idea that the work was essentially a second-century composition, and never relying on its evidence as trustworthy for first-century conditions, I gradually came to find it a useful ally in some obscure and difficult investigations.' Every reader of *St. Paul the Traveller* knows with what a wealth of detail Ramsay brings out the historical value of innumerable passages in Acts.

Another example of the freedom from conservative bias with which Ramsay first approached New Testament problems is found in the story of his last interview with that great scholar, F. J. A. Hort, in 1892. 'I mentioned that the period to which tradition assigned

[79] *Beginnings of Christianity*, v, p. 147.

the New Testament documents seemed to me to be correct in all cases except one. First Peter appeared to me to be fixed inexorably to a period A.D. 75–85. Before I could go on to state the inference which appeared to me necessary, and which I had drawn in one of my lectures—that the Epistle could not be the work of the Apostle—he broke in with much animation that he had always felt that there was no tradition of any value as to the date of Peter's death; the martyrdom was clearly and well attested, but its period rested on no authority. I caught from him at once the idea, which I have since worked out at some length, that First Peter, though composed at about A.D. 75, is still a genuine work.'[80]

But as time went on the apologetic motive seemed to dominate all that he wrote, and much of his later writing falls far below the high standard of scholarship maintained in his early books. It is not merely that periodical essays were flung together with little sequence of thought or method of arrangement to form a book (and that generally without an index). He allowed himself to assume a magisterial authority when discussing critical questions that lay outside his own realm of archæology. Thus Harnack, who some thirty years ago startled scholars in two hemispheres by coming out on the most conservative side with regard to the Lucan writings, recognized the damage done to the position which he represented by the leading exponents of the conservative case. 'In the history of the criticism of the New Testament an Apologetic with a dogmatic

[80] *Pauline Studies*, pp. 269 f.

bias has always promoted radicalism, or has at least made critics deaf to proofs. This is just the effect that it has had upon its opponents in the case of Acts. They were led to imagine that everything must be cleared away, and thus together with what is worthless they cast from them traditions that are certainly historical and information that is most valuable. To make matters worse, Blass went on to insult the work that had been hitherto done by the critical school, though at the same time he betrayed a very slight conception of deeper historical questions; again Ramsay set his clear eye, his powers of picturesque description, and his great learning at the service of a method which seeks to extract from the sources more than is really in them; while Zahn cannot efface the impression that he conducts historical investigations like a counsel for the defence *à tout prix*. Moreover, all these scholars, and those allied with them, showed little sense of the debt we owe to Baur and his followers, of the deepening of our insight into historical questions, and the broadening of our outlook that have been brought about by their labours.'[81]

In the year 1911 Dr. James Moffatt's *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* was published, and Ramsay wrote three articles in criticism of it in the *Expositor*. These were published as a small book with the title, *The First Christian Century*. As in all that Sir William Ramsay wrote, there is much to be learned from this review. Many readers will agree with some

[81] *New Testament Studies*, III, 'The Acts of the Apostles', trans. by J. R. Wilkinson, pp. 302 f.

of the points which the writer scores. Yet it cannot be said that his reputation was enhanced by this polemic. So conservative a critic as Professor James Denney, writing to Sir William Robertson Nicoll, says: 'Don't you think Ramsay on Moffatt has been very scrappy and unedifying? I don't see what on earth Moffatt has to reply to. He has not taken a single historical problem in the book and shown where and how Moffatt has gone wrong.'[82] In a letter to Sir Alexander Simpson, Denney writes: 'I find Sir W. M. Ramsay on Moffatt too discursive and irrelevant, and even in the ordinary sense too impertinent to be very pleasant or profitable reading. What right has he to lecture Moffatt as he does? I agree with him that Moffatt is wrong about the Papias tradition, but, if one may say so, he has a right to be wrong: he is a master in this business, and Ramsay has no right to talk to him as he does.'[83]

We must not, however, close on this note. The esteem in which this great scholar was held by famous scholars in many lands is shown by that monument of learning and of gratitude, *Anatolian Studies, presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay*, edited by W. H. Buckler and W. M. Calder (Manchester University Press, 1923). Twenty-six large pages are taken up with a list of his writings before that date. It would be a fine discipline for a young scholar, who wishes to specialize in New Testament studies, to go through Ramsay's published books and to compile a careful

[82] *Letters of Principal James Denney to W. Robertson Nicoll*, p.182 (London, 1920).

[83] *Letters of Principal James Denney to His Family and Friends*, p. 161 (London, 1922).

index of all Greek words dealt with, and another of all subject-matter that concerns the New Testament and early Christian history. Finally, we turn aside from all else that Ramsay wrote to commend that charming little book, *The Education of Christ* (1911). The sub-title is 'Hill-side Reveries'. Those who have never read the bulky volumes on which his reputation rests have missed much treasure. But if they slip this dainty little book into their pocket, and read it on the slopes of a sunlit hill, far from the crowd, they will come near to the heart of a man whose soul found rest in the peace of God that passeth understanding.

Index of Titles

Index of Proper Names