

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR,
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

SECRETARY: E. WALTER MAUNDER, F.R.A.S.

VOL. XLV.



LONDON:

(Published by the Institute, 1, Adelphi Terrace House, Charing Cross, W.C.)

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1913.

537TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,
HELD IN THE ROOMS OF THE INSTITUTE ON
MONDAY, JANUARY 6TH, 1913, AT 4.30 P.M.

THE REV. CANON R. B. GIRDLESTONE TOOK THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read and signed.

The SECRETARY announced that Colonel G. J. van Someren had been elected an Associate of the Institute.

*PRESENT DAY FACTORS IN NEW TESTAMENT
STUDY.* By the Rev. Canon R. J. KNOWLING, D.D.

PROFESSOR KIRSOPP LAKE in his recent work on the earlier Epistles of St. Paul mentions three factors of present and commanding interest. The first is one which is always with us, the discussion of the literary and critical questions connected with the various New Testament Books. And in addition there are two factors, which, in Professor Lake's judgment, have not received the attention which they deserve, the study of comparative religion, and another study, which is becoming more and more pressing, the study of psychology. For to understand the history of religion we are told that we must understand the psychology of religious men. These, then, are the three factors before us.

It may indeed seem presumptuous to attempt to deal with such important subjects in such a very brief space of time, but it may perhaps awaken some interest if we can test, however briefly, the bearing of these three factors, and of other literature connected with them.

I. Let us then start with that large portion of the New Testament that is occupied with the Epistles which bear the name of St. Paul.

It has become a commonplace of liberal literary criticism, with some few exceptions, to regard at least eight of these Epistles as coming to us from St. Paul, and to contrast this with the state of things in the days of Strauss and Baur. I do not stop over the vagaries of men like Drews in Germany, or of Van Esinga in Holland, who still persist in asserting that St. Paul never wrote any of the letters referred to him and who are prepared to go further and to refuse to admit the existence of St. Paul or of his Master.

I content myself with referring to the verdict of Dr. Harnack that the man who considers himself entitled to regard the *Hauptbriefe* of St. Paul as forgeries of the second century forfeits the right to be heard in the higher questions relating to literature and history. I will only in passing refer to an admirable reply to Drews and his followers in a recent American book by Professor Case of Chicago, entitled *The Historicity of Jesus*, 1912.

But I would ask you to consider for a moment those Epistles of St. Paul which are often the subject of the most persistent attack, viz., II Thessalonians, Ephesians, and the Pastoral Epistles.

No one will accuse Dr. F. C. Conybeare of a leaning towards conservative criticism. But we turn to his *Myth, Magic, and Morals*, p. xvi, and we read: "Of the Epistles of St. Paul, very few are now disputed by competent critics. I am disposed to accept as authentic all of them, not excepting the ones addressed to Timothy and Titus." (On the next page he adds that the Epistle to the Hebrews is clearly anterior to A.D. 70.)

Another point of interest which Dr. Conybeare makes in the page before us is that he speaks of the Epistle to the Galatians as probably the earliest of St. Paul's Epistles, and in this he agrees with a growing number of scholars.

But it is strange that Dr. Conybeare should use this Epistle to show, as he thinks, how remote it was from St. Paul's purpose to learn from those who had known Jesus personally. Consider, *e.g.*, the statement of the Apostle that he had gone up to Jerusalem to visit Peter, and that he stayed with him fifteen days. Can we doubt that during this visit he would have learnt many of the details of the earthly life of Jesus? * And we need look no further than the opening verses of this Epistle to see that St. Paul's Christology, his witness to the

* See, further, Dr. J. Drummond's little book on *Paul*, p. 89.

facts of the resurrection and the atonement was the same at this early date as that maintained by the brethren who were with him, and by the Churches of Galatia, whatever that phrase may mean.

It will be noted that St. Paul in his Galatian Epistle lays stress upon the gifts of healing, and it is popular in our own day to regard Christ as a Healer of astonishing power.

But whether we take Galatians or I Thessalonians to be the Apostle's earliest Epistle, we recognize that he assigns the first place to the miracle of our Lord's own resurrection, and we do well to follow his method of procedure.

Origen long ago did the same, and he, too, laid stress, as St. Paul did, upon the moral and spiritual effects of the miraculous powers which our Lord and, through Him, His Apostles possessed. A study from the papyri enables us to see something of the function of miracles in the New Testament and it would appear that in Mark xvi, 20, the thought is not only that the signs accompanied or followed, but that the signs acted as a kind of authenticating signature to the word.*

But I do not, of course, affirm that Dr. Conybeare's somewhat unexpected avowal should be regarded as final by all schools of thought, and II Thessalonians, Ephesians and the Pastoral Epistles are still keenly disputed. Personally, I think that the evidence, both external and internal, is fully adequate for their acceptance, and that that evidence has not been always realized at its full value. Thus we forget Renan's avowal that the external evidence for the Ephesians was as strong as for that of any book of the New Testament, and that external evidence has been increased by the statements in the recently recovered letter of St. Irenæus. It has been sometimes urged that the contents of this long-lost letter are disappointing, but at least they bear unmistakable testimony to the attribution of the Epistle in question to St. Paul. And yet the same old objections are raised again and again, as if they had never been answered. Professor H. A. Kennedy, writing a few months ago (September, 1912) with reference to the Pauline Epistles, remarks that he includes *Ephesians*, as the only argument which appears really valid against St. Paul's authorship is that of the *style*, and in this respect there seems to be a far closer affinity between *Ephesians* and *Colossians* than between *Colossians* and any of the other Epistles.

* Dr. G. Milligan, Inaugural Lecture in Glasgow, p. 20, 1910, and his comments on βεβαίω and ἐπακολουθέω.

Such a remark reminds us that Dr. Harnack is disposed to accept *Ephesians* as from St. Paul, because the acceptance of *Colossians* would seem to carry the acceptance of *Ephesians* with it. One of the most valuable defences of *Ephesians* comes to us from a member of the little band of Romanist writers known more or less to us in England, the veteran Dr. Johannes Belser, to whose name we may add that of the Frenchman Jacquier.

But much more unexpected is the candid statement of Professor Gardner in his recent well-known book *The Religious Experiences of St. Paul*, pp. 14-15. If it could be shown, he admits, that the whole of the third group of St. Paul's Epistles were non-Pauline, this would in some degree affect the basis of his structure. For it is precisely those parts of the Apostle's teaching which are most clearly set forth in *Colossians* and *Ephesians*, on which Professor Gardner lays special stress. But it seems impossible, he adds, that any disciple should use so exactly the thought, the manner, and even the language of the great Apostle, while yet there is no trace of such a man in history. The author of *Hebrews*, though Pauline in tendency, shows quite a distinct personality of his own. And we feel, as Professor Gardner concludes, that so great a writer as the composer of *Colossians* and *Ephesians* must have been could not have concealed his individuality completely behind that of his master.

The question of the authenticity of II Thessalonians has recently been revived by a remarkable suggestion made by Dr. Harnack in a paper read before the Berlin Academy. He argues that whilst the First Epistle to the Thessalonians was directed to the Gentile element of the Christian Church in Thessalonica, the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians was addressed to a smaller and earlier Jewish community. There is certainly remarkable language which might be quoted to support this contention, and it may be regarded as a working hypothesis, to which, as some of us will note, Professor Lake has given special attention. But anyhow it would be easy to quote many great names in support of II Thessalonians, as also of the much disputed Pastoral Epistles.

Special attention might be drawn in this connection to the defence recently made by Sir W. Ramsay of these Pastoral Epistles, and to the acceptance in Germany of II Thessalonians by writers so far removed from each other in many respects as Dr. Zahn, Dr. Clemen, and Dr. Deissmann. Nor should it be forgotten that Dr. Harnack does not refuse II Thessalonians to

St. Paul, and that he finds genuine fragments even in the Pastoral Epistles.

In this connection we may refer to the language found in that curious book republished some twelve years ago, after some three centuries and a half, *The Book of Philo concerning Biblical Antiquities*. In this the pseudo-Philo uses language and illustrations which might easily help to explain St. Paul's reference to fables and endless genealogies, whilst another curious apocryphal book, *The Book of Jubilees*, is full of the same matter, containing all kinds of legendary additions to the patriarchs' history.

Dr. Charles places this book in the second century B.C., and he writes concerning it, "The Pauline phrases, fables, and endless genealogies," "old wives' fables," "genealogies and fightings about the law," form a just description of a large portion of *Jubilees*. The "old wives' fables" may be an allusion to the large rôle played by women in it' (p. lxxxv).

One further feature of interest in the language of these Epistles may detain us for a moment. It would seem to be frequently characterized by the use of medical terms. St. Paul's acquaintance with St. Luke, and the frequent intercourse between the two men, might well account for this. Indeed, one recent writer has gone so far as to maintain that St. Luke must have been the author of the Pastoral Epistles because the medical terms are so numerous.

But quite apart from any such precarious suggestion, the use of such language becomes much more intelligible if we remember that at the time when St. Paul is maintained to have written the Pastorals he had with him St. Luke as the companion of his imprisonment.

But this consideration of the use of medical language is closely connected with recent criticism in another way.

In the *fourth* volume of his New Testament studies, when speaking of the date of the Acts, Dr. Harnack (p. 21, *New Testament Studies*) recurs to the question before us, and remarks that one of the weightiest arguments for the identity of the author of the "we" sections with the author of the twofold work, that is, for its composition by the physician, St. Luke, is the demonstration of the author's knowledge of and interest in matters of medicine. The instances produced first of all by Hobart, and then by Zahn and Harnack, have been assailed by P. W. Schmidt and Clemen. The latter of these seeks to deprive a part of them of their force, in some cases, perhaps, with success; and yet Clemen himself allows that

a good acquaintance with medical science and terminology may be ascribed to "Luke." This is quite enough for Harnack's purpose. One of a sceptical turn of mind might with reason dispute that the author of the Acts was a practising physician. If he, however, admits that this author possessed a good acquaintance with medical science and terminology, then the unanimous tradition that the author was Luke the physician receives the strongest support; for to what other Christian writer of the first two centuries can we ascribe such ground of acquaintance?

It may be noted in passing that Dr. Zahn, no less than Dr. Harnack, fully expresses his indebtedness to Dr. Hobart, and we may well be glad that English scholarship has gained such a notable recognition. We are often reminded by certain critics of the debt which we owe to the Germans. But we may fairly ask what do the Germans owe to us? They no doubt may point, for example, to many famous archæologists, to many famous investigators of the papyri and inscriptions, but we have a Ramsay, a Milligan, a Moulton, a Kenyon.

It may perhaps seem unnecessary to stop over this familiar feature in St. Luke to which we have more specially referred, but Dr. Harnack has thought it necessary to do so in the fourth volume of his series no less than in the first.

Not long ago the writer of this paper had occasion to examine very closely the medical language of St. Luke, and it was a great satisfaction to him to find that in a recent article in *The Lancet*, January 7th, 1911, the position taken up by Dr. Harnack was unhesitatingly endorsed.

One other point in connection with this use of medical language is not without interest. It has been suggested that St. Luke may well have acquired the power of shorthand writing in connection with his training in medicine, and we know from Galen that the students who attended his lectures were wont to take them down. Pliny, too, tells us of the *notarii*, or shorthand writers, who would write down rapidly from the dictation of their masters.

An additional interest may be fairly connected with this subject. In the *Studies in the Synoptic Problem* recently published by members of the University of Oxford, one of the writers, Mr. Streeter, remarks that "the sayings preserved in Q* were not taken down at the time by a shorthand writer." But we have been well reminded† that shorthand was employed by Cicero at the trial of Catiline, and great

* Q stands for the German *Quelle*, a source.

† *Hibbert Journal*, April 12th, 1912, p. 722, by Mr. St. George Stock.

improvements were made in the art just about the time of Christ's ministry.

While we are thus touching upon the Acts it is well to bear in mind how much both it and the third Gospel have been strengthened by recent investigations. It is quite recently that an inscription bearing the names of the two deities, Zeus and Hermes, was found at no great distance from Lystra. And if we turn to the Gospels it is of the highest importance to notice how two remarkable details have helped to establish the historical character of St. Luke's enrolment in the second chapter of his Gospel. It is not too much to say that indisputable and contemporary evidence now goes to show that about the date of the first census, 8 B.C., Quirinius was governing in Syria. And in addition to this we have evidence, as Dr. Deissmann so frankly allows, that it was a recognized custom, at all events in the Roman East, for people to return to their own homes or districts for purposes of the census. Other well-known Germans, as, *e.g.*, Carl Clemen, have also borne testimony to the various points of contact between the narrative of the Acts and the discoveries of recent years. Indeed, no student of the New Testament can fail to see the wonderful light which is being thrown upon the scenes, the language, the life, the topography of the several books, by the papyri, the ostraca, the letters, the inscriptions which recent years have made familiar to us. It is almost startling at first to recognize how the very titles which were used in addressing the Roman Emperors as, *e.g.*, *κύριος, σωτήρ, υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ, θεὸς ἐπιφανής*, found a place in the New Testament books; and thus we may see how the Apostles must have stirred a fresh and vital interest in the minds of their hearers, and how their message of the Lord of lords, and the Saviour of the world, must have appealed to the Roman world around them.*

And if we turn from great matters to small we can see the way in which the papyri assert their use. Thus no one can fail to note what a commentary we have upon St. Paul's counsel, "Custom to whom custom is due, tribute to whom tribute," Romans xiii, 7, when we remember that 218 different kinds of dues were payable in Egypt.

Or we turn to a letter dated A.D. 41 in which a man gives the counsel to a friend who was in monetary troubles, "beware

* "Apostolic Preaching and Emperor Worship," by Professor Kennedy, *Expositor*, April, 1909.

of the Jews," probably the earliest letter in which their habitual characteristic is associated with the Jewish people.

We turn to the word *ἀρχιποίμην*, Chief-Shepherd, used of our Lord by St. Peter, and not found elsewhere, but now traced to an inscription in the Roman period, on a wooden tablet round the neck of a mummy; apparently marking the fact that the wearer was an "overseer," or master perhaps of a guild of shepherds.

But whilst conservative critics rightly lay stress upon the position taken by Dr. Harnack with regard to the authorship of the third Gospel and the Acts, we cannot say that even Dr. Harnack regards every portion of these books as historical. And this is why it is so important to be able to corroborate the statements of the earlier chapters of St. Luke by fresh evidence, or to point to the Canticles of the same Lucan Gospel as bearing the evident marks of truthfulness. "A little less and these songs would be purely Jewish, a little more and they would be purely Christian." At the same time it is only too often forgotten that there is in Germany a strong conservative school headed by men like Feine and R. Seeberg, to say nothing of the generally recognized conservatives like Zahn and Nösgen and P. Ewald.

Dr. Harnack's own most recent statement with regard to the actual date of the Synoptists is indeed sufficiently conservative, and he tells us at the close of his fourth volume of *New Testament Studies* that the second and third Gospels, as well as the Acts, were composed while St. Paul was still alive, and that the first Gospel came into being only a few years later (*Date of the Acts and the Synoptic Gospels*, p. 162, l. 7).

But then we are obliged to face the further question as to what sources lie at the root of our Synoptists in their present form. The question is one which is admittedly full of the greatest difficulty. But it would seem that recent scholars ask us to recognize that there is a source Q (*i.e.*, the source common to St. Matthew and St. Luke, and with which St. Mark was also to all appearance familiar), there is the Gospel of St. Mark practically as we have it to-day, and there is a further source peculiar to St. Luke, which we may call S, containing those exquisite passages which St. Luke himself may have chosen out for special remembrance. I am not endorsing all these details, but it is necessary to mention them.

The further tendency of criticism would also seem to be to place Q very early, possibly some twenty years before Mark. Dr. Harnack in the volume to which we have just referred,

p. 125, maintains that it is earlier than Mark, and that nothing prevents it from being assigned to A.D. 50 or still earlier, so that Harnack allows that it may well have come to us from a personal acquaintance or disciple of our Lord.

Harnack, however, ridicules the argument that Q was written before the Passion because it breaks off before that event. Other critics, however, take a different view, notably Mr. St. George Stock in the *Hibbert Journal* for last April, pp. 723-4, and he asks what more satisfactory reason could there be for Q's containing no account of the Passion.

But without stopping over this, Dr. Harnack, as we have seen, is convinced of the high antiquity of Q, and in it he regards the words of our Lord in Matthew xi, 27, as authentic tradition, words which have been recently described as the greatest Christological passage in the Gospels. Wellhausen, too, and Schmiedel both regard the words in St. Matthew as spoken by our Lord.

The fullest account of the bearing of the whole passage, with an account of the literature which has gathered round it, is given by Dr. Schumacher of Freiburg (*Die Selbstoffenbarung Jesu*, 1912). It is, no doubt, quite true that Dr. Harnack does not interpret the words as many of us do, but at all events it seems certain that we cannot reject this saying, so Johannine in form and expression, as an interpolation or an accretion, but that it was actually attributed to our Lord in a document which Harnack assigns to the year A.D. 50 or even earlier. May it not be said of such a passage that it is testimony of the very highest value to the belief in Jesus and His own self-consciousness? He and the Father are separated in their essential nature from collective humanity.

Professor Burkitt, indeed, has recently made an interesting attempt to interpret the words and their context (*Journal of Theological Studies*, January, 1911). The towns of Galilee had not repented in answer to the announcement by Jesus of the Kingdom of God, and for this failure, as well as for the success in the reception of His message by the simple folk, Jesus thanks the Father. "I can stand alone," he seems to say, "unrecognized, for my heavenly Father recognizes me; I stand alone, I and my disciples, but it is we who know God and recognize the signs of His visitation." But may we not fairly ask if this explanation does justice to the words? can it be maintained that this passage places our Lord and His disciples on an equality in their knowledge of the Father?

But if Q contains no history of the Passion, the earliest

history of this, the greatest drama in the world's history, comes to us from St. Mark, which thus becomes not only as it has been called a new Gospel type, but also the transition between Q and the two later Synoptists.

With this transitional view of St. Mark before him, Mr. Streeter asks, who does not feel that St. Mark, the oldest of the Gospels we have, is the one we could best spare? And yet as we ask such a question, do not some of us feel that we could not afford to lose a single word or incident in that fourfold account of our Lord's closing hours which the Church has preserved for us? should we not miss that picture of "the Strong Son of God, Immortal Love," which in the old symbolism of the Gospels the Lion of St. Mark presents to us? should we not miss the Gospel which someone has even described as a "history of the Passion expanded backwards," so long a portion of the Gospel deals with that one last week? And as we open the closing pages of each of our Gospels we find ourselves face to face with no mere mosaic of texts, but with a matchless picture transcending the most consummate literary skill, and a true Christian science would lead us to exclaim as we stand before that picture, "This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes."

No wonder Professor Romanes could write, "True, or not true, the entire story of the Cross from its commencement in prophetic aspiration to its culmination in the Gospels is by far the most magnificent presentation in literature" (*Thoughts on Religion*, p. 160).

Before we pass to another class of literature closely connected with the Gospels, let us look for a moment at that Johannine passage in Q from another standpoint. It may be fairly alleged that more than one recent discovery has enabled us to trace the existence of Johannine phraseology at an early date in the Church.

In support of this, we might refer to passages in the *Didache* and possibly in the *Odes of Solomon*. With regard to the former, if we may place it with Dr. Sanday in A.D. 80-100, and with Mr. C. H. Turner at the same date, or even earlier still, its evidence becomes of the highest value. We have seen that Harnack places Matthew xi, 27, as early as A.D. 50, and it is not too much to add that he would also carry with him the verdict of many scholars when he maintains the likelihood that such words were known to St. Paul.*

But if it is rash to reject the early existence of Johannine phraseology, we may go further and maintain that it is

* P. Feine, *Jesus Christus und Paulus*, pp. 264, 265.

equally rash to affirm, as is so often done, that the whole historical character of the fourth Gospel is to go by the board. In England, it is true, leading utterances may still be constantly quoted on the conservative side. Thus, *e.g.*, Mr. C. H. Turner, in his *Studies in Early Church History*, p. 191, maintains that it still appears to him reasonably certain that one of the original disciples named John, whether the apostle or another, settled in Asia Minor, wrote the fourth Gospel there, and died about A.D. 100. And more positive statements still as to the authorship of the fourth Gospel by the beloved disciple might easily be quoted both in England and Germany.

But still it is often boldly affirmed that in Germany the Gospel of St. John is no longer to be regarded as a source in estimating the documents at our disposal say, *e.g.*, for a *Life of Jesus*, or for an examination of their teaching and claims. It is, therefore, well to remember in passing that one of the fullest and most thoughtful works upon St. John's Gospel in recent years comes to us from Germany. The title of the book is in itself sufficient to secure it a high place, *The Gospel of St. John as a Source for the History of Jesus*.

There is much in the volume with which we should probably not agree, but its great value lies in the fact that the writer, F. Spitta, so well known in other connections, regards the fourth Gospel as containing an original document which was the work of an eye-witness, and that this eye-witness was one of the most trusted friends of the Master, no less a person than the Apostle John.

It is worth noting that Spitta regards this portion of the fourth Gospel as still more reliable than the Synoptists as an authority and a history.

II. But no attempt to deal with the sources of our Gospels could lay claim to any fullness, unless we make some reference to those remarkable pseudepigraphical or apocalyptic books of the Jews which form in some respects a kind of background to the New Testament books.

Let us endeavour to give to some few of them a brief consideration.

The Assumption of Moses, probably dating soon after A.D. 6—the date assigned to it not only by Dr. Charles, but by Professor Burkitt—is written by a Pharisaic Quietist. He has to protest—it is in fact the very object of his writing—against the secularization of the Messianic ideal, and the growing political corruption of the Pharisaic party, against the notion so common, at all events in the middle of the century, that works were the means of salvation.

The Apocalypse of Baruch, the work of several authors, Pharisaic Jews, dating from A.D. 50–100, and containing portions to be assigned to a date before the fall of Jerusalem, again shows us in some of its sections the prevalence of a carnal and sensuous view of the Messianic kingdom, and in its dependence for salvation upon works, the need of the preaching of a Paul. If we take the passages bearing upon works and justification, it is not too much to say of them that “with every position here maintained Christianity is at variance, and Rabbinic teaching in full accord.”

The Book of Jubilees, dating, according to Dr. Charles, 135–96 B.C., is an attempt of a pious Jew, to which reference has already been made, and evidently a popular and widely read attempt, to describe the creation and the successive events in the history of Israel from the standpoint of the writer’s own times.

In doing this the writer severely condemns the laxity of his countrymen with regard to the keeping of the Sabbath, but at the same time he shows us how rigid were the requirements of an orthodox Jew, and, quite apart from the Gospels and St. Paul, what a fatal danger the spirit of Rabbinism might become. Whoever drew water or lifted a burden on the Sabbath was to die; whoever did any business, made a journey, attended to his cattle, kindled a fire, rode any beast, travelled by ship, whoever fasted, or whoever made war on the Sabbath, was to die. As we read such regulations, can we wonder that people turned from a religion which *might* become so mechanical and so devoid of spirituality to the teaching of Jesus? or that St. Paul saw in such a spirit a burden too grievous to be borne, and in the law and liberty of Christ “a more excellent way?”

In some respects the most remarkable of all these books is *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, coming to us in its Hebrew original from about the closing years of the second century B.C. This book in its later Greek form contains so many points of likeness both in thought and word with the New Testament that Dr. Charles has gone so far as to maintain that the New Testament writers were influenced by *The Testaments*, although he admits that the latter does actually contain many Christian interpolations.

But Dr. Plummer, who has written in support of the opposite view with great force and detailed examination, considers that *The Testaments* was influenced by the New Testament. It is noteworthy that by far the most of the alleged parallels to the Gospels are to be found in the Gospel of St. Matthew, and

in the sayings recorded in that particular Gospel (see to the same effect Jacquier, *Le Nouveau Testament dans l'Église Chrétienne*, p. 141, 1911).

But if St. Matthew's Gospel, as there is reason to believe, was from the first the most popular,* owing perhaps to its sayings and discourses, which would most readily strike the ear and remain in the memory, then we can account for the phenomenon mentioned. Moreover, it is very strange that these numerous similarities in thought and word should scarcely be found outside the New Testament books, in spite of their previous influence, and that, apparently, we have no *certain* evidence of *The Testaments* until the time of Origen.

One of the most remarkable features in these Jewish books is the omission, according to good evidence, of a suffering Messiah. And this becomes a matter of great importance at present, in face of the assertions of A. Drews, in Germany, that the idea of a suffering and dying Messiah was by no means unknown to the Jews.

But even in the memorable passage iv Esdras vii, 29, where we read that after 400 years, the Son of God, the Messiah, should die, such a statement has nothing to do with the great prophecy of Isaiah liii. In the passage before us there is no kind of suffering, the death of the Messiah is a purely natural one—there is no violence associated with it—not only is the Messiah to die, but all in whom there is human breath. It may even be that the writer meant to emphasize the thought of the new creation, which was to supersede the Jewish national Messianic hope (see further for this prophecy *International Journal of Apocrypha*, January, 1912).

Anyhow, the whole conception of a suffering Messiah was at variance with Jewish beliefs at the time of the Advent. All the Gospels bear witness to this, and it may be fairly said that it is not until after the fall of Jerusalem that we meet with this conception of a suffering Messiah in Rabbinical literature at all.

III. In dealing with the subject of comparative religion the relation of Christianity to the mystery religions is the question most freely discussed, according to Dr. Kirsopp Lake and Dr. Percy Gardner, in England, and they are strongly supported by Reitzenstein in Germany. But on the opposite side we have Sir W. Ramsay and Dr. Warde Fowler.†

* See Mr. C. H. Turner, *Journal of Theological Studies*, October, 1910.

† See his *Religious Experiences of the Roman People*, p. 467, and *The Modern Churchman*, April, 1912.

What was the thought which lay at the root of these great Eastern religions? It seems to have been that of the triumph of light over darkness, of death issuing in life, incorporated in myth and legend.

The eclectic Gentile, as Dr. Lake describes him, who would come under the teaching of St. Paul as to the meaning of the death of Jesus, would see every reason for equating the Lord with the Redeemer-God of the mystery religions. At Antioch, or Ephesus, or Corinth, or Rome, there would be men disposed to listen to the teaching which told of *σωτηρία*, which told that the soul could be raised above the perishable and the transient (as the best philosophy would hold) to an actual union with the Divine, and that this union would be effected in those "mysteries" of Christianity which promised the Gospel of eternal life.

But Dr. Lake makes a great and crucial avowal when he adds that for this salvation of the soul St. Paul's teaching would come to such a man with the advantage that this Redeemer possessed an historic character which could scarcely be claimed for Attis or Mithra.

We must omit the famous passage from Sir S. Dill, in which he contrasts the narrative of a divine life, instinct with human sympathy, with the cold symbolism of a cosmic legend. But it may be worth while to turn for a moment to Herr Gennrich, of Berlin, who has so well reminded us that the mediator whom Mithraism announced as a Saviour was but the personification of a power of nature, and the redemption instituted by such means was but a myth, devoid of any moral significance, and destined to hopeless failure when placed in the scale against the incomparable attractive power of the historical Saviour and Redeemer, Jesus of Nazareth. In Christianity that above all which separated man from God was not the unavoidable defect of a finite, earthly nature, but the personal decisive act of the human will against God (*Die Lehre der Wiedergeburt*, p. 87, 1907; see, too, on the same contrast between Mithraism with its legends and myths and the historical fact of the Incarnation, *Christus: Manuel d'Histoire des Religions*, by Professor J. Huby and other French Romanist writers, p. 396, 1912).

Once more we turn to the writer who has done more than anyone else to give us the salient points in the history and teaching of the religion of Mithra—"It was a strong source of inferiority," so he tells us, "for Mazdaism that it believed in only a mythical redeemer. That unfailing well-spring of religious emotion supplied by the teachings and the passion of the God sacrificed

on the Cross never flowed for the disciples of Mithra" (Cumont, *The Mysteries of Mithra*, p. 195, 1912).

Compare this passage with the vague language of Loisy who has given us a summary of St. Paul's conception of Jesus Christ (*Hibbert Journal*, Decennial number, October, 1911, p. 81).

According to Loisy, St. Paul entertains the conception of a Saviour-God after the manner of Mithra. But we note that, as a matter of fact, St. Paul never calls Jesus a Saviour-God, and that it is the reverse of scientific to institute a comparison between an historical person known to Paul, and an Osiris or an Attis, originally mythological personifications of the processes of vegetation (see for this, and a full description of the mystery religions, a series of articles in the *Expositor*, 1912, of great value, by Professor H. A. Kennedy).

May we not also ask what possible connection could there be between the legendary and mythical deaths of such gods, mere personifications of the seasons and vicissitudes of nature, and the redemption wrought by Christ with its moral and spiritual and universal import.

Let us briefly take two instances to show what a totally different atmosphere we breathe in the mystery religions, and in the teaching of St. Paul. Take, *e.g.*, the famous ceremony of the Taurobolium, in which the worshipper is buried, as it were, to his former self, and rises again to newness of life, after being drenched with the blood of the bull. And what was the effect of what Cumont does not hesitate to call this barbarous ceremony? The worshipper thus strengthened and purified by such means was regarded as the equal of a deity through this red baptism, and the crowd worshipped him in veneration. And yet how different, *toto calo*, from the attitude and conceptions of the Christian worshipper: "If we walk in the light as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin."

Or take as a second instance—the conception of faith in St. Paul, the conception of a personal surrender to a living Person of a life lived in the flesh, and yet lived by faith, faith in the Son of God, Who loved me and gave Himself up for me. Surely it is not unfair to say that there is no conception in the mystery religions which can be compared to this, and it reminds us, too, of the thoroughly ethical character of St. Paul's mysticism: Christ in you, the source and the giver of all good things, the strengthener of all that is pure and lovely and of good report: Christ in you, the hope of glory, deepening more and more the contrast between things seen and temporal and things unseen and eternal.

With regard further to St. Paul's dependence in his teaching upon the ancient mysteries, it may be admitted that certain words, common enough in the mystery religions, are used by the Apostle. And yet even here we must be careful. When words like *τέλειος*, *φωτίζειν*, *μνείσθαι*, are alleged in this connection, we have been well reminded that the first two may be derived from the LXX and that the verb *μνείσθαι*, although a technical term, is used only once by the Apostle, and that in a purely figurative sense.

But it may be said with equal truth that other terms common enough in the mysteries are altogether omitted by St. Paul. And, in this connection, we may again refer to the list which is given us by Dr. James Drummond, which contains such words as *τελετή*, *τελέομαι*, *μύστης*, *μυστικός*, *μυσταγωγός*, *καθαρός*, *ἄργια*, and others (*Hibbert Journal*, April, 1912, and see also Cheetham, *The Mysteries, Pagan and Christian*, pp. 17, 18; and further, p. 31, as against the statements of Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, p. 203).

No doubt certain words and phrases were, as it were, in the air, and St. Paul's Gentile converts could scarcely help being acquainted with them. It was, too, quite likely that St. Paul would take up such words and fill them with a deeper and fuller meaning, as, *e.g.*, a word to which we have already referred like *σωτήρ*. But this is a very different thing from supposing that St. Paul himself learnt and taught from the mysteries. At the same time we may learn from a man like Clement of Alexandria how often an educated Christian, acquainted with pagan mythology and its cults, might love to use even technical terms proper to the mysteries, and to employ the old language in describing Christian knowledge and experience (Glover, *Conflict of Religions*, p. 269).

Ought we not, too, to bear in mind an influence to which we shall recur upon St. Paul's thought and language, that of the Old Testament, even in many cases which are assigned by writers like Reitzenstein to Hellenistic religious usage, and the documents of the Hellenistic mystery religions.

It is not too much to say that such terms as *ψυχή* and *πνεῦμα*, with their cognates, may be traced back to Old Testament usage. And the same may be said of two other familiar terms, *εἰκών* and *δόξα*, which are closely conjoined by Paul in I and II Corinthians. So, too, it certainly seems preferable to find a parallel for the phrase "to put on Christ," Galatians iii, 27, Rom. xiii, 14, not in the ritual and religion of Mithra as Dr. Pfeiderer did, but in the Old Testament Scriptures.

With regard to the morality of these mystery religions, we must not forget that it had its good side; it sustained a belief in the unseen, it promoted human brotherhood it helped to satisfy man's deepest cravings for a freedom from degradation and evil, although the standard of purity in some respects failed to rise above that of the pagan world. Justin Martyr (and so, too, Tertullian) is often ridiculed for his statement that wicked demons imitated the Christian Eucharist in the mysteries of Mithra. But apart from the fact that the Mithraic Eucharist was in all probability open to those only who had attained the degree of Lion, and who, therefore, were called Participants, such language shows us that the Christians would not be likely to borrow consciously from the mysteries.

At the same time we must admit, although perhaps with some qualification, that at least one of these religions, that of Mithra, aimed specially at purity, and that this distinguishes the mysteries of Mithra from those of all other Oriental gods. "Serapis is the brother and husband of Isis, Attis the lover of Cybele, every Syrian Baal is coupled with a spouse, but Mithra lives alone," and from him continence receives a new reverence (Cumont, *Oriental Religions*, p. 157, l. 7). This purity, indeed, encouraged work and action, and in its severity it attained a moral elevation which appealed to heart and mind alike.* "Above all," writes Chantepie de la Saussaye in his famous *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*, II, p. 500, "the religion of Mithra was a religion of action and of moral strength." Mithra, indeed, claims the title of the "Invincible" God. And yet it is not Mithra but the Galilean who has conquered. The claim of Mithra has not been sustained, but Christ still speaks to-day of an assured and universal sovereignty, Christ, the deathless King, Who lived and died for men: "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world."

Before we pass on, it is of interest to note that no one has spoken more strongly as to any influence of the mystery religions upon the mind and the work of St. Paul than A. Schweitzer, whose name is already so familiar to us in England.

* Dr. Warde Fowler (see page 43) maintains that the word *sanctus* in its application to Mithra showed at least that his life was pure, and that he wished his worshippers to be pure also. But here again do we not come across the fatal distinction, so far, that is, as Christianity is concerned, between a mythical and an historical record? *Op. cit.* p. 470.

One thing is certain, urges Schweitzer, that St. Paul could not have known the mystery-religions as they are presented to us, because in their developed state they did not at the time exist. It is in considerations of this sort, Dr. Schweitzer further maintains, that a great authority like Cumont can point to the difficulties which stand in the way of the view that the mystery-religions had any influence upon the oldest Christianity, and that he specially regards it as quite excluded that St. Paul could in any way be connected with the religion of Mithra.

Schweitzer (*Geschichte der Paulinischen Forschung*, p. 151) severely takes to task those who develop out of the accounts of different religions a kind of universal mystery-religion, which in such a form had never existed, least of all in the time of St. Paul. To what pressure must these myths and rites have been subjected, he exclaims, before the statement could be possible that there is present in many Oriental religions a belief in a dying Saviour-God, who dies and rises to life again? and where, he asks, do we find anything of this death and resurrection in the case of Mithra?

But here we come across an important inquiry. No one, we note, has condemned more strenuously than Schweitzer any belief in the borrowing by St. Paul from the matter of the mystery-religions. If we ask to what then does Schweitzer maintain that St. Paul was indebted, we find that he refers us to those sources which in his belief have been most neglected, viz., those apocalyptic and pseudepigraphical books of the Jews to which we have just referred. He expresses indeed, unbounded astonishment at the neglect of the Ezra-Apocalypse, which undoubtedly treats of many of the subjects associated with the teaching of St. Paul, upon sin and the fall, upon the choice of Israel, the meaning of the law, the Parousia and the judgment.

But if Schweitzer had condescended to read and study the works of English theologians he would not have failed to gain a knowledge of the scholarly and exhaustive edition of the Ezra-Apocalypse which has just been given to us by an accomplished Hebraist, Mr. Box. In the prefatory note we are told that whilst there are many points of contact with the Gospels and the Apocalypse, the most striking are the resemblances between this Jewish thinker and St. Paul, resemblances which we may ultimately trace to the school of Gamaliel, and which render the study of iv Ezra second to none in value amongst the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical books in their bearing on the New Testament.

But whilst we bear in mind all this fresh and growing

material as amongst the most valued factors for New Testament study, yet we must not forget that St. Paul, especially in his eschatology, was dependent not merely upon current Jewish literature and tradition but upon the canonical books of the Old Testament, and above all upon the teaching of our Lord Himself. It is a matter of further surprise that this fact has not been more emphasized, and we are put off with the bold assertion that St. Paul knew nothing of the teaching of his Master, whereas what may well have been his first Epistle, 1 Thessalonians, is full of what may be justly regarded as reminiscences of our Lord's own eschatological discourse.

But without pressing this we may recognize in Schweitzer a strong supporter of the view that St. Paul looked to Judaism, and not to Hellenism, for his theological knowledge and teaching.

IV. We pass to a brief consideration of the relation of psychology to New Testament study. In this connection it may be noted that we have just had an able book not so much upon psychology in general as upon the psychology of the New Testament by Mr. M. Scott Fletcher, Lecturer in the University of Sydney, with a preface by Dr. Rashdall. This book contains an interesting and valuable study of one of the most epoch-making events in the New Testament, the Conversion of St. Paul. And it is of importance to note that the writer maintains that the vision on the Damascus road should be classed as objective, and not merely subjective. "The vision theory makes the appearance of the glorified Christ a merely subjective experience on the part of Paul. But the New Testament as a whole regards the spiritual world as objective. . . . The main point to remember is that the New Testament regards man as open to God on the spiritual side of his nature. The psychological explanation is not in itself adequate, although the Biblical standpoint does not exclude a psychological account of the strictly human conditions under which the conversion took place. It supplements it and does more justice to all the facts of the experience" (*The Psychology of the New Testament*, pp. 185-187).

I do not, of course, say that we should endorse these remarks *in toto*, but such an explanation stands out in marked contrast to the attempt to identify St. Paul's "thorn in the flesh" with epilepsy, and then to affirm that his "visions and revelations" were the result of abnormal psychical conditions. The question has lately been asked in Germany, "War Paulus Epileptiker?" and more than one medical man of eminence in Germany has

been concerned with an answer to this inquiry. The pamphlet, the title of which has just been given, was written by Dr. A. Seligmüller, Professor of the Study of Nervous Diseases in the University of Halle. According to Dr. Seligmüller none of the symptoms attending upon the severer form of epilepsy were present in the case of St. Paul. The Professor passes in review many of the alleged instances of epilepsy, and maintains that for some of them at all events the evidence is very slight. He concludes that one of two kinds of disease was that from which St. Paul suffered, viz., either malarial fever or *Augen-migräne*. Sir W. Ramsay, who closely examines the German pamphlet in the *Expositor*, November, 1911, sees no reason to alter his former view that malarial fever was meant, and that such a fever, as many inscriptions found in the country, and published in recent times, attest, was regarded as a direct penalty inflicted by some offended deity.

But another eminent physician has joined in the dispute in Germany, Dr. H. Fischer, Professor of Chirurgery in Breslau (*Die Krankheit des Apostels Paulus*, 1911). Dr. Fischer argues for regarding St. Paul's weakness as epilepsy, but that if so it was epilepsy of the less severe kind, and—a most important point—he adheres to the belief that St. Paul himself clearly distinguishes between “the visions and revelations” vouchsafed to him in II Corinthians, xii, 1-6, and of which he speaks with hesitation and reserve, and the “seeing” which he referred to as the basis of his claim to the Apostolic office, and which occupied the forefront of his teaching, “Am I not an Apostle? have I not seen Jesus our Lord?” (I Corinthians, ix, 1, and xv, 8).

Thus then for Dr. Fischer no special disease needs to be mentioned to account for the Conversion on the Damascus road—that was an actual event which St. Paul himself expressly differentiates from the other visions vouchsafed to him. It is an interesting acknowledgment from an accredited medical authority.

St. Paul's Conversion thus stands out as the type of a sudden conversion as contrasted with a gradual conversion, although there may well have been psychological factors which contributed to it.

But whether we class conversions as sudden or gradual, or whether we make a wider division, and classify them as moral, spiritual, intellectual, practical, yet as we study the New Testament we can scarcely fail to see their evidential value and bearing. The Church, for example, found itself face to face in Corinth with a gigantic task, with a society which had become

a bye-word for vice and licentiousness, and as we read the terrible catalogue of sins in St. Paul's exhortation to the Corinthians (I Corinthians vi) we cannot fail to be aware of something of the change which must have been involved, as men turned from such degrading vices to holiness and virtue. "And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God" (I Corinthians vi, 11).

And as we pass for a moment beyond the New Testament we are conscious of the same transformation from the power of Satan unto God. "St. Augustine," writes Romanes, "after thirty years of age, and other Fathers, bear testimony to a sudden, enduring, and extraordinary change in themselves, called *conversion*. Now this experience has been repeated and testified to by countless millions of civilized men and women in all nations and all degrees of culture. It signifies not whether the conversion be sudden or gradual, though, as a psychological phenomenon, it is more remarkable when sudden and there is no symptom of mental aberration otherwise. But, even as a gradual growth in mature years, its evidential value is not less" (*Thoughts on Religion*, p. 162).

But psychology has much to say, not only to conversion, but to the glossolalia, as Dr. Kirsopp Lake so fully reminds us in one of his appendices to his recent work on St. Paul's Epistles. What he says is sufficiently startling. The fullest investigation of the glossolalia is perhaps owing to a recent essay by an American student, E. Mosiman, an essay which he has published in German, giving us a most valuable historical sketch of the various phenomena connected with the speaking in tongues. The writer is not prepared to deny that the speaking in tongues was a gift which had its place in the opening life of the Christian Church. But still it was connected, not with the highest, but with the lowest stages of religious growth and Church life, and the greatness of St. Paul is seen in the fact that these ecstatic conditions, at all events in Corinth, were subordinated by him to those gifts of the Spirit which were the most important and the most essential; those gifts, *e.g.*, which find a place in St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, in which he notes as the fruits of the Spirit—love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, temperance—Galatians v, 22 (*Das Zungenreden*, p. 133, 1911).

In conclusion, it is my earnest hope that this consideration, brief and sketchy as it is, of the three factors which were mentioned at the outset, and of the literature connected with

them, may serve to maintain an interest in New Testament study, and may help us to realize that in this Book of Books we have the words of truth and soberness, wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and words spoken by men of old, who spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost.

DISCUSSION.

Canon GIRDLESTONE, who was in the Chair, said it was very encouraging in beginning a fresh year to have such a paper as this. It cleared the air in these days of confusing criticism. We owe a deep debt to Dr. Knowling, and also to our Secretary for reading it.

I wish to make a few comments on the paper on points that have struck me.

(1) Page 36. This being the year of Pitman's centenary it is appropriate to consider this question of shorthand writing. It is very important, and the time may come when we shall find that shorthand is really much older than we have ever given it credit for. The Jews spoke slowly, and we may well conclude that speeches were often taken down in shorthand. The pictures discovered on walls in Egypt show us scribes with note-books and pens (?) in their hands.

(2) Page 38. The passage commencing "A little less, etc.," might be applied to the whole of Christ's teaching. It was post-Jewish but pre-Christian. No Apostle could have invented one of Christ's parables. I believe that the whole of the Gospels were brought to memory by the power of the Eternal Spirit. It is impossible that the Gospels could have been compounded out of Christian "sources." Perhaps even the mysterious Q may prove to be a fictitious personage. The Gospels bring us face to face with things which Jesus actually said and did. He is the true "Source."

(3) Page 41. The author refers to the Apocalyptic expressions in the Gospels and to the supposed influence of such writings as the Book of Enoch; these would require considerably more proof before being accepted. The dates of these works were difficult to ascertain. There were far more proofs of the dates of the books of the New Testament than of these.

(4) Page 45. With reference to the writer's use of the expression "Saviour-God." In the Epistle to Titus we have the expression "Our

God and Saviour." The word Saviour is used of Christ very few times in the New Testament, scarcely at all in the Gospels and Acts. But it is frequently used to represent God the Father; indeed the expression "Saviour-God" is practically an Old Testament term and is embodied in the name Jesus (the Lord the Saviour).

The DEAN OF CANTERBURY said: We are deeply indebted to Dr. Knowling for this excellent paper. I have had the pleasure of knowing him for 30 years; he possesses one highly important qualification in his extremely wide acquaintance with current literature on this subject. He not only knows German and reads that literature, but studied Dutch also with a view to understanding the views of Dutchmen on similar subjects. This review is very comprehensive and thorough. He has phenomenal patience, and we may rely on all he says in its more important features.

When we contrast the gigantic importance of the Gospels with the work of the critics, the latter appears but trifling. It is but scraping the bark of a mighty tree and is too often a great waste of time. Those who deny the actual existence of Christ or St. Paul, as some seem to do, can only be treated as suffering from a mental disease. Sound criticism is in danger of being misled on this question of the sources of the Gospels. All seem to recognize that St. Mark was the earliest; then comes Q, from which Luke and Matthew are said to have quoted, and great stress is laid on this. At a recent Diocesan Conference, more authority was attached to Q than to the Gospels themselves! But I would ask: supposing there is a Q, what do we know of it? If we cannot trust Luke, why trust Q? Because St. Luke quotes Johanna, wife of Chusa, do we attempt to find out what she thought? Is it not enough to take what St. Luke says about her? The authority of the four Gospels we know. Luke, for example, was a full-grown man when Christ was on earth. We must not rely upon the sources, but upon the endorsement of the sources, if they exist, by the Evangelists. But the one Source often ignored is the Holy Spirit, and I re-echo one of the author's remarks: "This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes." Let us contrast these Gospels with current biographies; of the latter we have many nowadays, some 500 pages in length, but here the story of the greatest Life is contained in four short pamphlets, and the whole character has lived ever since. The living Christ stands before the world, arising out of the Gospels.

Some of these critics write as if they understood the Gospels. We certainly can understand much, but if anybody can fully understand them he must be as great as the Christ of Whom they tell. With reference to the author's remark that Germany owes much to English critics, I am reminded of Dr. Hobart, whose authority on the medical words used in St. Luke's Gospel and the Acts is recognized as being of the highest. The history of St. Paul's voyage has been studied by a Scotchman, Mr. Jordan Smith, who sailed over the whole course, and who says that the story can only have been written by an eye-witness and one who was a landsman. He also made an invaluable comparison of the Gospels in his *Harmonies of the Gospels*.

I should like to make the suggestion that the last chapter of St. Mark may really have been written by him, but the mass of the Gospel written by St. Peter himself. These facts, worked out by English scholars, are too often ignored to-day, but will go far to explain the difficulties which perplex us; but the general results are very encouraging. The picture of Our Lord as told in the Gospel holds its own. Every assault against their historical truth has failed. Time has been on the side of the conservative views. One great advantage in German criticism is that a later critic is invariably found to dispose of the earlier one. "The children devour their parents," but in saying this I would emphatically say that there is in Germany a devout criticism of a highly valuable order.

Dr. EUGENE STOCK thanked Colonel Mackinlay for his invitation to attend this meeting. Recently he had been making a special study of the Pastoral Epistles, and it was delightful to him as an amateur to find his conclusions confirmed by so eminent a scholar. He would like to mention one fact—the expression "Christ Jesus" is exclusively a Pauline one. There are four exceptions in the Authorized Version where "Jesus Christ" is used instead, but the Revised Version changes all these to "Christ Jesus." This phrase is found in the Pastoral epistles just as frequently as in the rest. He expressed his deep indebtedness to Canon Knowling for his paper. As to the authorship of St. John he wished to recommend a series of articles by Canon Scott Holland in the magazine of the Student Movement. He also referred to an old book by T. R. Birks called *Horæ Apocalypticæ*, which has lately been republished.

Mr. DAVID HOWARD referred to the fact that St. Paul's testimony was very important, as he was at the earlier period of his life a hostile witness, and probably resident in Jerusalem during our Lord's life. Surely St. Luke himself taught him the inner history of our Lord's teaching. The Apostles were in full knowledge, being eye-witnesses, of what they wrote. And why should we assume that St. Mark and St. Luke had not their knowledge direct from them?

If we believe, as I trust we all do, that the Gospels were written by those who were either with our Lord during His life or intimate friends of His Apostles, why should we inquire where they got their information from, in the same way that we look into the histories of Bede or Gerald the Welshman, who record events of which they could have no personal knowledge?

The CHAIRMAN proposed a hearty vote of thanks to the lecturer, which was carried unanimously, and the meeting terminated.

Communications were received from Chancellor LIAS, Colonel MACKINLAY, Mr. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. HIGGENS.

Chancellor LIAS wrote: "In regard to the remarks on the genuineness of the fourth Gospel, I think that before the question is represented as settled, some attention should be paid to the facts, which I myself pointed out in 1875, that the doctrine found in *all* the Epistle-writers is traced to its source, the authoritative teaching of Christ, by the Apostle St. John in his Gospel, and that, in every case, its form in that Gospel is more elementary than in the Epistles. The matter therefore in St. John's Gospel must have been everywhere current in the Church, long before that Gospel was written, and must be attributed to the Lord Himself. The great doctrines of the Incarnation and the Divine Indwelling of God in the believing soul are *not* found in the Synoptists, but they are found in every Epistle, except perhaps that of St. Jude. They must therefore have formed part of that great 'deposit' of faith committed to the Apostles by our Lord Jesus Christ."

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

In reading the generous criticisms which have been made upon my paper by the Dean of Canterbury and Canon Girdlestone, it is refreshing to note the stress laid by both of them upon one factor in New Testament study, viz., the work and inspiration of the Holy

Ghost. Not long before his death, the great German classic and theologian, Dr. F. Blass, in speaking upon a sceptical pamphlet from the pen of one of his countrymen, remarked that in this little pamphlet, on the meaning of the New Testament, the greatest existing reality in the world is ignored; Scripture calls this reality the "Holy Spirit." It is the recognition of this superior factor of which no Christian can be unmindful. But in the criticisms before me I note that the historical element is by no means forgotten.

Chancellor Lias has again reminded us with great force of the evidence for the early witness of the phraseology of St. John. This is most important, and what the Chancellor has so well said falls in entirely with the remarks upon which I have ventured.

The use of the various New Testament titles given to our Lord is a theme productive more and more of fresh interest since the recovery of so many of the papyri, and it is a matter of thankfulness that Dr. Eugene Stock has so kindly drawn attention to this subject.

In the treatment of the Jewish literature, the Book of Enoch was accidentally omitted. Its numerous and independent points of contact with the New Testament will be found in Dr. Charles's *Book of Enoch*, now republished after twenty years of fresh study.

It is important to note that, as in the Psalms of Solomon, with its striking Messianic picture in Psalm xlii, so no mention is made in Enoch of a Suffering Messiah, and that the Son of Man in the pre-Christian parables shares God's throne, which is also His own throne, and that all judgment is committed unto Him, although Dr. Charles thinks that our Lord used the title Son of Man with a deeper spiritual significance.