

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXXV.—NO. 4.

---

OCTOBER, MDCCLXXXIV.

---

ARTICLE I.

DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN.

*Doctrine of Original Sin, as Received and Taught by the Churches of the Reformation, Stated and Defended.* By the Rev. Dr. R. W. LANDIS. Whittet & Shepperson, Richmond, Va., pp. 541.

This is a posthumous work of Dr. Landis, Professor of Theology in the Danville Theological Seminary, Kentucky. It arose out of a discussion between him and the admirers of Dr. Charles Hodge, touching the doctrine of the latter about the manner of the imputation of Adam's sin to the race, which Dr. Landis conducted in the DANVILLE and the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEWS. He complained that the supporters of Dr. Hodge in the Northern Church, to which Dr. Landis belonged, resented all criticism of their leader in a factious, tyrannical, and popish spirit, which refused to give a fair hearing to the truth, and even punished him for daring to assert that truth against their great man. Hence Dr. Landis felt that no resource was left him, in defending God's cause and his own good name, except the publication of his full views and their grounds. He therefore devoted the latter years of his life and the riches of his own magnificent theological library to the laborious and careful composition of

## ARTICLE VI.

## SOME RECENT APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

The rank growth of apocryphal literature in the early Church is a puzzle to many, and the inference has even been drawn that it must have arisen before the canonical books had acquired the high authority that is now accorded to them. No doubt a truly reverent mind would abhor the thought of forging a divine book. But, after all, the human soul is very hospitable and will readily entertain together the most contradictory notions. While it is logically inconceivable that true reverence can coexist with a desire, or even willingness, to strengthen God, or correct God, in the records he has seen fit to give us, historically even pious men have been guilty of pious frauds. Heretics and misbelievers were naturally much more untrammelled in seeking to lay at the base of their systems a better foundation than their mere assertions furnished. As a matter of fact, almost all of the very early false Gospels, Acts, or Apocalypses, sprang up among the Ebionitish and Gnostic sects; represent, in fact, in various degrees of purity of descent that esoteric literature in the possession of which they gloried, and which they called in their pride "apocryphal" or "hidden" books—books too sacred and good for the common eye to look upon; though the irony of time and truth has sadly altered the connotation of the boastful term. So far from their origin arguing the non-existence or low estimation of our canonical books, it was the existence of the canonical books which incited their composition; it was the teaching of the canonical books which necessitated their invention for its correction and explanation; and it was the supreme authority of the canonical books which determined their form and nature. Because the doctrines of the Church did not profess to rest on an argumentative basis, but on the authority of apostolic writings, therefore every heresy which would gain for itself any credit must exhibit for itself a like foundation. A Marcion might use the shears and assert that his system was the teaching of the restored canon of truth; a Valentinus might press allegory to

VOL. XXXV., NO. 4—9.

the extremest limit in the effort to found himself on the unmutated canon; a Simonian might boldly oppose his "Great Announcement" to the Christians' "Glad Tidings"; but the great majority of the sects from the beginning, and all of them in the end, were driven to meet the true apostles with false apostles, the true Gospel with false Gospels, the true Revelation with false Revelations. It was late when "orthodox" Apocrypha began to appear, and when they did appear they proved but adaptations or imitations of the heretical books, and alike with them the vehicles of falsehood.

We have the less excuse in deeming the rise of such a literature unnatural in the presence of an inspired canon, that no age of the Church has been free from such fungus growth. Most certainly the nineteenth century is familiar with it. Did the early Church produce an apocryphum which could outdo the "Book of Mormon"? Nay, every form of false teaching that arises among us sooner or later exudes in the lighter and more innocent forms of apocryphal productions. We feel certain that the truly apocryphal literature of the past decade has been tenfold richer than that of any one decade at any previous age of the Church's life. One autumn gave us two rather startling apocryphal Apocalypses. Quite a crop of apocryphal Gospels spring up nearly every year. In form and character these Gospels offer a very curious parallel with the similar productions of the second and third centuries. Some of them class with those early pseudepigraphs which, whether as forgeries or as a matter of mere form, represented themselves as the compositions of companions of our Lord or his apostles; while others, with similar purpose, are put forth more frankly as histories rather than as autoptic narratives. All alike, however, exhibit both the genus and the differentia of the class *apocryphum*, and can be arranged under no other category; all are heretical writings, teaching falsehood and striving to commend it by substituting for the canonical Gospels a more correct account of the life and teachings of our Lord.

Among these recent apocryphal Gospels there are a few which have obtained, by reason of their literary character, or the repu-

tation of their author, or some extraneous cause, a considerable circulation among our churches, and are not failing of some influence on our people. The purpose of the present paper is to call the attention of pastors to them as dangerous books, to point out their character, and to warn the Church at large against their circulation. Some of them have already appeared in more than one edition; they are found in the most unexpected hands; and they are doing what they can wherever they go to undermine faith in the divine nature and saving work of our blessed Lord. Our purpose is not, therefore, critical, but expository; not scientific, but practical. We shall content ourselves with pointing out what these books are, without stopping to refute them; and if what we shall write has any scientific value, it will be only as one fragment of the history of the religious vagaries of an age peculiarly, perhaps unprecedentedly, rich in religious vagaries.

“RABBI JESHUA.”<sup>1</sup>

To begin at the bottom, the book called “Rabbi Jeshua” is the most frankly rationalistic of these before us. The very name, which is intended to suggest that Jesus was merely a Jewish teacher, foreshadows the tone of the book. It is significant also in another direction, as a sample of one of the methods which these apocryphal Gospels adopt to give themselves a flavor of scholarship and so practise on the credulity of their readers. Our present writer speaks with contempt of “one of our popular writers” who “has confessed that even when undertaking so

---

<sup>1</sup>“Rabbi Jeshua, an Eastern Story.” New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1881. We have used the American reprint; but the paging of the English edition (London: C. Kegan Paul & Co., 1881) is the same. This essay was already ready for the press when “Bible Folk Lore, by the author of ‘Rabbi Jeshua’” (London: C. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1884), appeared; a work written with the same purpose of reducing the Bible to the most rationalistic level, and with the same insufficient knowledge, and in the same partisan spirit. At the end of it are given extracts from the reviews of “Rabbi Jeshua” and of General Forlong’s “Rivers of Life.” If the prefixed “by the same author” is meant to apply to both of these, we now for the first time learn the author of “Rabbi Jeshua.”

serious a task as the compilation of a 'Life of Christ,' he did not consider it necessary to master the three stout folios which comprise the Mishna or text of the Talmud;" whence it may be not unfairly inferred that he professes to have himself begun by mastering them. As there are, however, few other signs of his Shemitic studies visible, it would never have done to fail to exhibit them in strange, and therefore learned, forms of familiar proper names. Both his learning and that of Dr. Clarke in "The Legend of Thomas Didymus"—of which more anon—takes at all events this chief outlet, sometimes not without curious results. The "Rabbi Jeshua" of our present writer is in the mouth of Dr. Clarke "Joshua-bar-Yosheph," which, as a transliteration of the Shemitic original, strikes upon our un-Rabbinically trained ear as a little peculiar. The Baptist is to one author "Hanan"; to the other he is "Johann," the "son of old Zabdi." "Rabbi Jeshua" permits us to rest our weary eyes on the familiar "Nazareth," and even "Jehovah"; but Dr. Clarke's cruelty insists on "Nazirah" and "Yahveh." Indeed, we must admit that Dr. Clarke beats "Rabbi Jeshua" on his own ground: he gives many more of these curious forms than he; those he gives are more curious; and he treats them all with a lordly inconsistency, perhaps to show his complete mastery over them. He alone can give us such monsters as the constant "El-jah" (but "Elijah," p. 47), "Solyma" (but "Solomon," p. 60), "Daweid" (but "David," p. 21). With all his boasted Talmudic learning, then (perhaps because of it), the author of "Rabbi Jeshua" must be content to stand second here.

He is second to no one, however, in the boldness of his dealing with the evangelical documents. Taking his start from the theory of the origin of the Synoptics, which makes Mark the original, and both the others only free re-workings of his material, he assumes at once such an extreme position as to rid himself of everything but Mark at a single blow. That Matthew and Luke are but fanciful elaborations of Mark, we are told, follows from the two facts, that "in no case do they agree in any statement which contradicts one made by" it (which is true enough, but does not

prove the matter in hand), and that "no two of the later versions<sup>1</sup> are in accord concerning facts not noticed by<sup>2</sup> it (which is so laughably false<sup>3</sup> as to suggest the suspicion that our author has neglected to make himself acquainted with the three thin volumes that constitute the synoptic Gospels, while studying the "three stout folios which comprise the Mishna"). The complete untrustworthiness of the additional matter they furnish is apparent from (1) the free use they make of miracle and supernatural machinery,<sup>4</sup> and (2) the utterly contradictory character of the legends themselves. Thus to our author as to Baur and such moderns as Loman, the presence of the supernatural element is confessedly the first and chief criterion of untrustworthiness. The amount of the supernatural—both the number of the legends and the circumstantiality of their details—grows with each new Gospel,<sup>5</sup> but the oldest reworking of them all—our Matthew—is already entirely untrustworthy, and bears its origin in a controversial purpose on its face.<sup>6</sup> It thus only remains to characterise these untrustworthy documents before they may be left totally to one side. Matthew was plainly written to show "how Rabbi Jeshua fulfilled in every respect the Pharisaic expectations of a Messiah," and "breathes the spirit of the narrow Pharisaic sect of Shammai."<sup>6</sup> Luke "breathes the liberal spirit of the opposite party of Hillel and Gamaliel, and introduces many latitudinarian

<sup>1</sup> It is part of the author's plan to speak throughout as if he were dealing with an immense mass of evangelical records of about equal value. See p. vi. and p. 20. When he comes to name them he is reduced to the canonical Gospels.

<sup>2</sup> P. ix.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the last edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Art. "Gospels" (of which more anon) on this point—p. 712*b.*, ed. Stoddard; and p. 709*a.*: "Hitherto the Triple Tradition—(as well as the double tradition of Matthew and Mark and of Luke and Mark) has consisted mostly of short 'words of the Lord,' set in a framework of short narratives, and very seldom agreeing exactly for more than seven or eight consecutive words. But we now come upon 'words of the Lord' in Matthew and Luke, some of which agree exactly for several sentences." Thus the agreement of Matthew and Luke in "facts not noticed by Mark" is far closer than either or both with Mark.

<sup>4</sup> Pp. 17, 160. Cf. p. x. <sup>5</sup> P. 160, *sq.* <sup>6</sup> P. vii., *sq.*

views."<sup>1</sup> As for John, it is a "cabalistic writing" beneath whose "repulsive mysticisms" some poetical beauties may be hidden, but to which we can certainly go for no facts, but in which rather the true facts of Rabbi Jeshua's life are "finally altogether lost beneath the overgrowth of a semi-pagan mysticism which culminated in his deification."<sup>2</sup>

Mark, then, is our sole credible authority, and it is refreshing to turn away from such characterisation as we have heard of the other Gospels, to learn that Mark was veritably written, as the Church has always believed, by a companion of the Apostle Peter's—or, as our author prefers to call him, "Simeon-bar-Sad-dik"—and embodies "the recollections of this aged puritan;" that it is "honest," "trustworthy," "simple" in the best sense, "artless," and contains information which, though scanty and imperfect, is yet genuine; that it apparently follows with care "the historical sequence of events," and preserves "many of the maxims of Rabbi Jeshua" "interspersed among descriptions of the minor events of his short career."<sup>3</sup> But though thus genuine and authentic and honestly written, even Mark's Gospel needs critical reconstruction. For it, too, has a marvellous element, though the "number of its miracles is smaller" than those of the other versions. "The peasant chronicler was influenced by the superstitions of the day,"<sup>4</sup> and his "ignorance" and "credulity" could not fail to stamp themselves on his pages. He believed in desert demons and demoniacal possession and his memory "prone to exaggeration and to love of wonder, must have magnified many occurrences, which, had they been described by an educated and impartial eye-witness, would have seemed natural enough."<sup>5</sup> The very late period of his life when Rabbi Simeon's recollections were written down—after the fall of Jerusalem—only increased this tendency. "It is clear that an original account written by a European (had such an account been possible) would have been entirely free from the supernatural element." "As, however, no such document exists, we must make the best use of the genuine material available, discounting as far as possible the idiosyncrasies of the writer, and striving to form some kind of idea

<sup>1</sup> P. viii. <sup>2</sup> Pp. viii., 159, 157, etc. <sup>3</sup> P. ix., sq. <sup>4</sup> P. 159. <sup>5</sup> P. 162.

of the actual facts which he relates."<sup>1</sup> The author promises us, thus, a life of Christ founded on Mark's Gospel when sifted from its miraculous element.

It cannot be denied that our author comes to this sifting process with alacrity and proceeds in it with bold touch. Nor can it be denied that to approach the matter with the open avowal that nothing supernatural will be admitted to be possibly true, gives a writer a great advantage over those who try to disprove the existence of the supernatural in the history. He can deal with all miracle *en masse*, and, concerning himself little with details, content himself with now and then pointing out a ground for miraculous stories in the constitution of human nature in general and of peasant Oriental nature in particular. "The miraculous event cannot be true; now, what may be true instead?" is a far easier riddle to unloose than the hopeless task the faint-hearts set themselves, which requires them to exhibit a *per se* easier and more plausible explanation than the miraculous one, for each miracle in turn, and so prove that nothing supernatural does exist in the history. Occupying the former position, our author has small difficulty in disposing of miracle. He feels justified in stating that Jesus did no miracle, at the beginning, instead of at the end of his argument: "There is nothing in the life which we are about to study which would appear extraordinary or impossible, if the events were supposed to have happened in our own times, and so long as the scene was laid not in Europe but in Asia."<sup>2</sup>

This does not imply a denial that Jesus was thought by his contemporaries to have wrought miracles. He was a great physician, trained by the best practitioners of his day (the Essenes), and the superstitious East attributes all cures to a supernatural agent.<sup>3</sup> Thus the suddenness with which he acquired fame (which cannot be denied) explains itself readily: an ignorant and superstitious peasantry could not do otherwise than attribute "his simplest cures to a supernatural cunning, or to the aid of mighty spirits who obeyed him."<sup>3</sup> As a matter of fact, however, nothing is recorded of him which "has not been performed by men who

---

<sup>1</sup> Pp. ix. and xi.   <sup>2</sup> P. xi.   <sup>3</sup> P. 79.



have laid no claim to peculiar sanctity or to supernatural power," "and which may not be witnessed in our own times and in our own country, not less than it was in the East, nineteen centuries ago."<sup>1</sup>

Nor does it necessarily imply that Rabbi Jeshua partook in the superstitious understanding of his own deeds; it would have been impossible for him to withstand the popular belief and it was useless for him to protest. He did protest. In the only case of raising the dead that is attributed to him, he asserted clearly that the child was not dead but only asleep.<sup>2</sup> And over and over again, in the case of nervous diseases which formed the mass of those he healed, he asserted that the cure was due to the mental state of the recipient.<sup>3</sup>

Prophecy is dealt with in the same broad way. It is clear, on the one hand, that Rabbi Jeshua's clear vision could not have escaped forebodings as to his end, and these must have influenced his conceptions of the character and career of the Messiah; and "there is nothing in the reputed prediction" of the destruction of Jerusalem "which differs from the ordinary language of apocalyptic literature of a period earlier than that of Rabbi Jeshua's career."<sup>4</sup> On the other, "it is extremely difficult to estimate the effect—conscious or otherwise"—after so long an interval of time as elapsed before Mark was written—"on the writer of the actual course of events. It is possible that the predictions attributed to the Rabbi may have been materially enlarged or modified in accordance with the subsequent facts; that with the ordinary license of Oriental literature, so called prophecies, never actually uttered, may have been inserted into the narrative; and that minute details may have obtained an unnatural importance through the supposed connexion which they may have had with the fulfilment of scriptural prophecies."<sup>5</sup> It is part of the advantage of the attitude our author has taken up towards the supernatural that these loose and somewhat contradictory remarks appear to him to justify his neglect of the problem of our Lord's prophecies.

From the standpoint of reason, all this is very satisfactory,

---

<sup>1</sup> P. 82. <sup>2</sup> P. 80. <sup>3</sup> P. 81. <sup>4</sup> P. 136. <sup>5</sup> P. 116.

provided it is useless; but unless one begins by denying that there is anything supernatural to explain, it does not explain anything. Our author exhibits wisdom, however, in refraining from an examination of the miraculous details. When he does allow himself to be betrayed into them, he cuts much the same helpless figure that others do in this kind of work. We have seen that he can only explain the prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem by supposing that the "honest" chronicle has been "dishonest" here, and, "though not intending to deceive," has put into the mouth of Rabbi Jeshua words which he never spoke. Of the paralytic who was let down through the roof, he can only say that "so great was the patient's faith in the power of the Master that he was able to obey the imperative command of the Rabbi, who adjured him to rise and walk."<sup>1</sup> The possessed are only "maniacs and nervous patients" whom the Physician soothed and healed.<sup>2</sup> The healing of the Gadarene is reduced to such an outputting of nervous power, while the swine are frightened by the frightened crowds who flee from the maniac's violence<sup>3</sup>—an explanation apparently borrowed from Dr. Farrar, who supposes it to have been "the shrieks and gesticulations of the powerful lunatic" that "struck uncontrollable terror into the herd of swine"—but, whether in Farrar or "Rabbi Jeshua," inconsistent with the plain matters of fact recorded in Mark, fanciful in its details, and but one more specimen of the kind of naturalistic explanations on which Strauss executed justice in the person of Paulus.

About the greatest of all miracles, the resurrection of Jesus, our author has very little to say. It would be a supernatural occurrence, and the "original text of the chronicle of Rabbi Simeon" does not record it. Consequently he feels justified in dismissing it with a vague remark about the Semitic mind being "characterised by a tenacity which prevents the eradication of an idea once firmly grasped," and the consequent inability of "the Rabbi's disciples to grasp the fact that their hopes were at an end and their hero departed," so that, "remaining expectant" after their Master's death, "legends sprang up" among these

---

<sup>1</sup> P. 75. <sup>2</sup> Pp. 72, 160. <sup>3</sup> Pp. 75, 76.

“simple-minded, devoted, and grief-stricken” people.<sup>1</sup> In such a case as this, however, the simple statement, “There is no evidence in the chronicle of Simeon that any of the immediate followers of the Rabbi ever again beheld him in life or death,” amounts to a *suppressio veri*. To say nothing of the evidence of Paul and John—the chief Epistles of one of whom and the Apocalypse of the other our author will scarcely deny to be genuine—evidence earlier than even Rabbi Simeon’s veracious chronicle, and on weighing the true bearing and full implication of which some of the time wasted in wading through the dreary wastes of the Talmud might have been profitably expended, it cannot be unknown to our author that this chronicle itself bears witness to Jesus’s resurrection. That broken edge in which it ends is prophetic of something to come. Moreover, Simeon does tell us of the empty tomb, and it will not do to dismiss it with a word about “frightened and marvel-loving Oriental women.” Krim has, indeed, asked somewhat satirically if it is on an empty tomb that Christianity cares to base its claims. But if our author has the leisure to consider it fully, he may discover that much needs to be said concerning that simple and in itself non-miraculous fact—a fact, therefore, of a sort which even an ignorant peasant might be able to be a credible witness of.

It is thus, at all events, that our author obtains to his own satisfaction a non-miraculous Mark on which to found his exposition of the life and teaching of Rabbi Jeshua. We fear, however, that we cannot consider him, from his own point of view, a careful or exact historian. He not rarely puts forward as facts circumstances uncritically drawn from untrustworthy sources—even from the revolting cabalistic composition which men now call the Gospel of John. At the head of the very first chapter, for instance, stand the words, “Hanan of Bethania.” We learn at page 13 that it was “whilst Hanan was still preaching and prophesying at Bethania that Rabbi Jeshua first appeared prominently in public,” and we are afterwards told that John was a Galilean (p. 71). The Gospel of John is our sole authority for any connexion of John with Bethania, while we have not even

---

<sup>1</sup> P. 164, *sq.*

it for the assertion that he was a Galilean. The new-built synagogue at Capernaum (p. 69) is filched from Luke, while the attribution of a dome to it (p. 73) is probably a slip in the interests of Oriental coloring. These are all small matters—or would be small in another; but in our present writer they are significant, and if John and Luke can be trusted for these facts, why not for others too? Nor does the artful interpreter of the artless narrative of Simeon-bar-Saddik make as full use of his materials as he might. For instance, he is observed at times to know exceedingly little about his subject: where he was born, or when, or from what parentage, or even tribe—of all this he is strangely uncertain. He may have been born at Nazareth (p. 22), or perhaps at Capernaum—probably the latter (p. 70); his father was probably a mechanic (p. 22); as to his tribe, it is only certain that he was not of the house of David (p. 22)—seeing that it was probably long since extinct, and “his only recorded utterance on this subject was clearly directed against such a theory: ‘How say the Scribes that Messiah shall be the son of David? for David calls him Lord; how then can he be his son?’” Now, this excessive doubt may lead us perhaps to a very high estimation of the caution of our author; but it is scarcely justified if the highly praised and “honest” narrative of Simeon is at all worthy of confidence. That Jesus was understood to be, and to claim to be, the son of David, Mark x. 47, 48 (cf. xi. 10) apparently evinces; what rank in life his parents held follows inevitably from Mark vi. 1, *sq.*; from the same passage it follows as inevitably that Capernaum was not the place where he was brought up, while such as Mark i. 24; x. 47; xiv. 67; xvi. 6, sufficiently point out what was his own country. Nor does this excessive doubt about such plain matters of fact, about which the “artless Simeon” could scarcely have a prejudice, even late in life, contrast prettily with the exact and detailed knowledge which our author claims as to the personal appearance of the child Jesus, the education he received, and the influences which formed his character, of none of which does the honest narrative of Simeon drop a single hint, and in his vivid description of which our author ranges himself alongside of the Matthews and

Lukes, Farrars and Geikies, whom he calls very hard names for introducing imaginative touches, and especially supplying from fancy the traits of the childhood of Jesus.<sup>1</sup> That Jesus did receive the usual education of a village child, we agree with our author, however, in thinking probable, though that he was a learned Rabbi (p. 71) neither the artless Simeon nor any other record will permit us to believe; nor indeed could the village school have given him the requisite training for such a function. Nor are we concerned to deny that such a man as he makes Jesus out to be might have been formed by the influences which he enumerates as having formed Rabbi Jeshua; but, again, that these influences formed Jesus, we have absolutely no historical warrant for believing.

The man that he actually portrays as "Rabbi Jeshua" cannot be said to be an unnatural kind of man. For it is not to be denied that the frank Rationalism which reduces Jesus at once to a man of his time and race, and which can praise the "rude chronicle" of Simeon-bar-Saddik, because in it "he is presented in his true character as a Hebrew fatalist and an Oriental prophet;" does, by its very thorough neglect of all miracle, succeed in putting before us a life that might have been lived—a purely natural life for the time and scene. To ignore or pare away all that is above nature, and then refuse to trouble one's self about the marvellous consequents, of course succeeds in leaving a residuum that is, in a sense, natural. The life of Jesus here presented to us, accordingly, does not fit into the place in the history of the world, which the life of Jesus ought to fill, any more than a rush-light can take the place of the sun in our system; it leaves the subsequent course of history utterly unaccountable, and throws the student, as he traces back the varied lines of development to their source in this new creation, lost in puzzled amazement to see them centre in nothing, and each end, not in a beginning of adequate impulsive force, but in empty vacuity; but so long as one keeps his eyes shut to these things, it gives him a sketch of a being who might have lived at that time; in a word, of a possible man. We are asked to consider him the product of the ordinary

---

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 15, 16.

influences about him; of school life, and manly rebellion against its traditional lore; of the influences of John the Baptist; and of the experience of the painfully deep and sharp contest between the high and the low in a society that lacked a middle class (p. 25). We are asked to behold him, after that, as first an ascetic anchorite, drawing out a solitary hermit's life in the wilderness, and then, after John's imprisonment, "conscious of the power within him, of genius chastened by ascetic probation, and full of the great message which there was none now left to declare to men since Hanan was no more," "once the learned Rabbi, but now the zealous Essene," "hastening back to his native land to take upon him the fallen mantle of his Master" (p. 71, cf. p. 85). The contradiction of this picture with the "honest" and "trustworthy" narrative of Simeon is characteristic: according to it Jesus was confessedly John's Master (Mark i. 7); he began his preaching before John's death (i. 14); the "hermit life" is limited to forty days (i. 13); and it is a false view of "that fox, Herod Antipas," which makes him, like our author, only John the Baptist risen from the dead.

Coming thus as an Essene, and with an Essene's reputation for prophecy and magical healings, and being withal not only a "great scholar," a "poet," a "devout ascetic," a "pure-minded and gentle Rabbi," but also "a great physician," who healed the diseases and won the love and admiring wonder of the rabble; it is not strange that Jesus obtained sudden fame as a miracle-worker (which reputation he vainly disclaimed), and perhaps, also, in a narrower circle as a prophet. As his life, so his teaching was essentially Essenic; there is little original in what he taught, though his authoritative manner contrasted with the method of the Scribes, who were anxious to trace each statement back to some learned authority. He also dealt originally with the law, though he never came in conflict with its teaching (p. 99). And in two points the matter even of his teaching may be called new: "his doctrine of the poor and ignorant," and "his doctrine of the expected Messiah, whom he claimed to be" (p. 97). The first of these was, however, in essence Essenic (p. 99), and the second he shared with most of his contemporaries (p. 103); but

not, it should be noticed, with the Essenes. He did not at first believe in his own Messiahship, but when once he reached that conviction he held it confidently (p. 121), and it gradually changed materially the character of his mission (p. 85). In his own view, his Messianic life and work came to so swallow up everything else that his teaching is of comparative unimportance. Thus his recorded utterances are fragmentary and without connexion, and "no great ethical system, no strikingly novel views of morality, nothing in short beyond the teaching of the law of Moses, as studied according to its original spirit, is found in the sayings of Rabbi Jeshua" (p. 111). It is thus his character which is of chief importance. But he does not appear to have been essentially elevated above his age. His morality was asceticism, and its standard an impossible one, though his "stern fanaticism" "condemned without scruple all who hesitated to go the same lengths with himself in the zealous pursuit of holiness" (p. 102). His exegesis, although it returned to the spirit of the Old Testament writers, led him into false views and expectations. His faith was Oriental fatalism (p. 128), led by which he marched calmly to his doom (p. 121). His philosophy was poor (p. 120), his logic Rabbinical (p. 118); even ignoble casuistry was not foreign to him (p. 110). He was, in a word, a well-meaning man, but just a man of his times and nothing more.

It is the less necessary to enter into any extended refutation of this view of the life of Jesus, that it is clearly inconsistent in its every detail with the one document on which it is professedly founded. Just those especial traits and "facts" which transform Mark's narrative irrecognisably are supplied from the fancy of the modern writer. The distinctive feature of this reading of the biography, the germ out of which all else grows and which determines its whole course, is the representation of John the Baptist as an Essene, his baptism of Christ as a conversion to Essenism, and the gathering of disciples around Jesus as the founding of an Essenic community. But what authority is there for making John an Essene? Neither the "artless" narrative of Rabbi Simeon, nor the artful one of Josephus, nor anything in the Talmud where the Essenes are not even mentioned, drops a hint to

suggest it; but on the contrary, the sources manage in a very few words to make it the most unlikely of hypotheses. Even with Mark alone beneath us we may repeat Godet's words: "If John was taught by the Essenes, it must be admitted that the only thing their instruction did for him was to lead him to take entirely opposite views on all points."<sup>1</sup> We may glance, however, at the assertions by which our author attempts to support his view, if only to gain some knowledge of his methods of work. John, then, he tells us, "as a member of the sect of Hasaya, inculcated the duty of washing in cold water as conducive to chastity" (p. 6). He passed his life in exhortation, denunciation, and "in the purifying rites of frequent washings" (p. 7). "Rabbi Simeon," however, tells us that the meaning of John's baptism was a totally different one from this, viz., unto the remission of sins, and that it was administered only on confession of sins; and that Jesus and his followers—who were, according to "Rabbi Jeshua," John's disciples—so far from inculcating frequent washings, were marked men for the opposite tendency (Mark vii. 1 *sq.*), to say nothing of the implication (Mark xi. 30) that John was not understood to be continuing a distinctive practice of a well known sect. Moreover, John's Messianic hopes, his doctrine of sin as a matter of will, his isolated life, his free association with the people—all are in direct disproof of any Essenic tendency in him. And Jesus himself an Essene! One could have hoped that among English-speaking writers, at least, this out-worn fancy were long since consigned to deserved oblivion. One laughs at the elaborate proof that is offered (p. 89 *sq.*) in support of so impossible a proposition. Even such facts as that Christ sometimes visited the trans-Jordanic region, that he was a man of peace, that he was unmarried, that he believed in the immutability of the soul, are made to do duty in this interest. Facts are even invented, as that Jesus lived a hermit life, the duration of which is not set by Mark (p. 27, but cf. Mark i. 13), that he lived as an ascetic, and taught the duty of celibacy and of communion of goods and frequent ablutions. The main arguments are, however, drawn from his mild teaching, his asserted neglect of the great feasts at Jeru-

---

<sup>1</sup> Com. on Luke, E. T. I., 118.



salem and of sacrifices, and his success as a physician. We may well content ourselves for reply to a reference of the reader to some discussion of this matter among recent writers.' Here let us only note how inconsistent with the "trustworthy" chronicle of Simeon the whole contention is. Christ, whenever he was in Jerusalem, appears continually in the temple (Mark xi. 11, 15; xii. 35; xiii. 1; xiv. 49); he ate the passover, involving the sacrifice (xiv. 12), though our author tries to escape this; he commands others to sacrifice (i. 44); and he comes to Jerusalem in order to attend at least one feast. Many of the traits of Jesus' life are the direct antipodes of Essenic requirement, *e. g.*, they were the strictest known Sabbatarians (Jos. B. J., ii., 8, 9); Jesus was not (Mark ii. 23—iii. 6); they made much of constant lustrations (Jos. B. J., ii., 8, 5), Jesus did not (Mark vii. 1—23); they morbidly dreaded defilement, and avoided every contact not only with strangers, but with all not of their sect (Jos. B. J., ii., 8, 5, and 10), Jesus mixed freely with all (Mark ii. 15); they distinctly denied the resurrection (Jos. B. J., ii., 8, 11), it was precisely the resurrection that Jesus affirmed (Mark xii. 18 *sq.*); they commended celibacy, while such passages as Mark x. 5 *sq.* (cf. ii. 19 *sq.*) sufficiently prove that Jesus had no low estimation of marriage. In suppressing these facts, it looks very much as if our author were suppressing truth. We ought not to be, however, ungrateful to him; there is a depth beyond even him to which he might have gone. Or was Birnie's book, as well as Seydel's, published too late to be of service to him? <sup>2</sup>

Of course, such a man as "Rabbi Jeshua" is pictured, could not fail to come into conflict with the Sadduceism of the ruling party. Like Savanarola, he became a political martyr—the vanquished opponent of established tyranny, and the instrument of

<sup>1</sup> See, for instance, Lightfoot's *Com. on Col.*, p. 158 *sq.*, where the refutation is complete. Cf. also the passage in *The Legend of Thomas Didymus*, p. 297.

<sup>2</sup> Birnie's "De invloed van de Hindoebeschaving," etc. (Deventer, 1881), goes so far as to hold that Buddhist doctrine and asceticism had already penetrated to Egypt, and Christ had visited Alexandria and learned of them. Seydel (1882) holds that Christ knew Buddhism, and accounts for much in the Gospels from its influence.

his death was the same—"unscrupulous falsification of evidence." We wish we had space to quote the whole account of the trial and condemnation in our author's words; it must suffice, however, to indicate that he supposes Jesus to have been condemned by a trick of the high priest. "Blasphemy among the Jews consisted . . . in the utterance of the divine name, and the Mishna states clearly that the blasphemer was not guilty until he expressed the name, 'which, when the judges heard, they were instructed to stand up and rend their garments, which might never again be sewn.' How, then, are we to understand the fact that after the simple answer, 'I am,' had been given by the prisoner, the high priest arose at once and called the Sanhedrim to witness, by the rending of his garments, that the divine name had been uttered, the pronounciation of which, according to its letters, condemned the prisoner to death. There is but one explanation possible, and this we find in reading the chronicle in Hebrew, for the word 'I am' was the ancient and original form of the holy name, by which Jehovah himself had made himself known to Moses. With hateful cunning the high priest placed on the words with which Rabbi Jeshua naturally answered the direct question, perhaps asked with that very object, a construction which must have appeared plainly unjust to every person present. He declared that the divine name had been spoken, when only an affirmative answer of the same sound had been given; and on this malicious and arbitrary decision the death doom of Rabbi Jeshua, whom the assembled Sanhedrim had been unable to find guilty in any other matter, was cruelly pronounced."<sup>1</sup> The "cynical Roman's" consent was easily obtained and the populace quickly yielded their favor when they learned of the wilful blasphemy. So he was hurried to his death. And worse. "Like a Savonarola" here, too. "Rabbi Jeshua was fated to leave not even a relic of his mortality. The women who came to embalm his body found the tomb broken open, the body no longer within. The stone had been rolled away and the vanishing figure of a white-robed stranger was seen or believed to be seen by the terrified and dismayed mourners, who fled forthwith from the sepul-

---

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 139-141.

chre." Thus the curtain falls, for ever. "Many were the legends which arose in consequence of this mysterious sequel to the history of the great Rabbi; but the chronicle of Simeon-bar-Saddik closes with the account of the open tomb and the trembling women; and of Rabbi Jeshua, as of Moses, it may truly be said that, 'no man knoweth his sepulchre unto this day.'"<sup>1</sup>

Thus our author leaves us standing over an empty tomb. It bears no message to him but of a broken sepulchre and a fleeing thief. How symbolic of the effect upon the reader of his own history! We gaze into its pages only to feel again that we are standing by an empty tomb. And can he actually think that the empty tomb under the walls of Jerusalem is not enough to found Christianity upon, and yet offer us his empty tomb as a substitute? He may hide from his readers that Mark's Gospel closes in a poor torn and broken edge—prophetic of something beyond. But he cannot hide from students of history that his own gospel stretches out a terribly lame arm for the grasp of the future. Not the Christian only, seeking his Lord, but the historian also, seeking an adequate origin for all that has come from "the Galilean prophet," will point out to him that he has violently torn out the heart of the story, will shake wise heads as they observe him busied with the husks from which the life has fled. Not thus—not in this only—could have arisen that faith which believed and made the world believe in a Risen Lord.

#### DR. ABBOTT'S "PHILOCHRISTUS" AND "ONESIMUS."<sup>2</sup>

To pass from "Rabbi Jeshua" to "Onesimus" and "Philochristus" is like passing into a new world. The improvement in breadth of information, minuteness, and soundness of scholarship and literary power, is so vast, that we feel for a moment as if we had passed from some arid Sahara to a rich and fertile upland, and begin to steep our senses in the new delight. It is not long,

<sup>1</sup> P. 150.

<sup>2</sup> *Philochristus. Memoirs of a Disciple of our Lord.* Second Edition. Boston: Roberts Bros., 1878. And *Onesimus. Memoirs of a Disciple of St. Paul*, by the author of "Philochristus." Ditto, 1882.

The secret is so open that it is no longer a secret that both books are by Rev. Dr. Edwin A. Abbott, Head Master of the City of London School.

however, before we learn that, despite its external beauty, we have not yet reached a land in which a man may live. The luxuriant growth covers plague-spots from which arise poisonous exhalations, and we are soon almost ready to declare a preference for the hard, dry, and deadly, but at least not treacherous, air of the desert. The frank rationalism of "Rabbi Jeshua" may be more unlovely to look upon, but it is scarcely more pernicious, and it presents a sturdier and more manly front than the half timid but no less obnoxious rationalising of "Philochristus."

The deeper and more sensitive scholarship with which we have to deal is shown at once in the theory of the origin of the Gospels which our new books set themselves to commend. This is chiefly set forth in "Onesimus," which, therefore, though the latest written of the two, demands our first consideration, inasmuch as it furnishes the basis of criticism of the documents on which the exposition of the Life of Christ, given in "Philochristus," is founded. Here, too, Strauss preceded Baur; but Strauss's labors can but rank as baseless fabrics of dreams until Baur's thesis is justified. It is not our purpose, however, to enter upon a detailed criticism of the documentary hypothesis of this author either. This is the less necessary that these books are understood to come from the same pen that gave us the learned article "Gospels" in the latest edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, to which "Onesimus" kindly directs our attention (p. 307), and in which a detailed and scientific account and defence of the theory here illustrated may be read in a sufficiently succinct form. Our object is fulfilled in giving a simple exhibition of its essential elements.

Dr. Abbott, then, accounts for the resemblances between the Synoptic Gospels, not on the hypothesis that they borrowed from one another, but on the supposition that they are all three based on a common traditionary source, which he calls the "Triple Tradition," and which he would restore by picking out the parts of the gospel narrative common to Matthew, Mark, and Luke. This "Triple Tradition" represents the most original form of the gospel history, and is most closely followed by Mark—though that Gospel only very roughly corresponds to it. So far we may go fairly well with Dr. Abbott; but from this point we diverge

from him most widely. For, when we come to ask whether this "Triple Tradition" gives itself a trustworthy account of the life of Christ, the third book of "Onesimus" gives us an emphatic negative for reply. Dr. Abbott holds that already before the "Tradition" had come to the hands of the Gospel-writers, it had passed through several stages of growth<sup>1</sup> and had developed into almost irrecognisable shapes. Men in the early Church even seemed to vie with one another in inventing fulfilments for every Old Testament sentence in Jesus' life, and in transferring to the region of literal fact every trope used by or of him.<sup>2</sup> Nor is the matter added to the "Triple Tradition" by our written Gospels any more trustworthy. The eighth book describes Onesimus's amazement when he first heard it, and tries to illustrate its legendary origin. It was not until "towards the end of the reign of Vespasianus, or not much before," that "the churches began to commit to writing the traditions and acts of the Lord;"<sup>3</sup> and not until "the second year of the Emperor Domitianus"<sup>4</sup> that Onesimus first became acquainted with our Matthew, which seemed to him "a new Gospel," "so great a change had fallen on the Church since I had last tarried in the great city about fifteen years before," and the origin of which was absolutely uncertain.<sup>5</sup> It was only after long and trying debate with himself that Onesimus could decide what he ought to do with the three written books of the gospel; but at last, being persuaded that if he let falsehood in upon the Church, the Lord would provide some future teachers who could "have skill to sift" it out again,<sup>6</sup> he determined, on a plea of expediency, to allow his flock to read them. For himself, however, he had knowledge of the truth; "there was a certain Philochristus, a Jew by birth, but not one of the Jewish faction, a man of some learning, who had studied Greek letters at Alexandria; and he had been a disciple of the Lord Jesus, having himself seen the Lord in the flesh." "From the lips of this, my beloved teacher, I received the tradition of the words and deeds of the Lord, pure and uncorrupted; and it was no small strength and refreshment to hear the very sayings of Christ himself from one whose love of truth appeared in this

<sup>1</sup> "Onesimus," p. 86. <sup>2</sup> P. 87. <sup>3</sup> P. 268. <sup>4</sup> P. 272. <sup>5</sup> P. 274. <sup>6</sup> P. 285.

saying of his: . . . that 'he loved to think of the Lord Jesus as Son of man and also as Son of God; but he loved no less to think of him as the Eternal Truth, whom no lie could serve nor please.'"<sup>1</sup>

Thus, in true apocryphal fashion, Dr. Abbott puts forth "Philochristus" as the original and true Gospel in opposition to the corruptions of the canonical Gospels. Its acceptance as such involves the rejection of the Gospel of John entire,<sup>2</sup> and with it of all of the Synoptics which is not part of the Triple Tradition, as unknown to the immediate disciples of the Lord<sup>3</sup> and probably false.<sup>4</sup> It involves still farther the rationalising of everything miraculous contained in the Triple Tradition itself; and the total reconstruction of its narrative on non-miraculous lines. The reader of the article "Gospels," in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, alone is not in a position to fully understand Dr. Abbott's attitude towards the gospel-history. It is not for us to say whether or not "Onesimus" represents a later stage in the development of his opinions. But certainly from "Onesimus" we gain a clearer insight into the extreme radicalness of his attitude; here all semblance of historical caution is lost, and Dr. Abbott frankly undertakes to reconstruct the Triple Tradition itself on fanciful and non-historical principles. We are at once exonerated from any attempt to refute his theories by this circumstance, and need only remark in passing from them, that in approaching Philochristus the reader is to expect to find—from Dr. Abbott's standpoint, mentally sublimated truth—from our standpoint,

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 269, 272.

<sup>2</sup> The Gospel of John had not been written when Philochristus and Onesimus wrote (although the Apostle John was already dead), and little is therefore said of it. But the "editor" of "Philochristus" kindly tells us that the author "makes no mention of any of the acts or long discourses nor set dialogues of that Gospel," yet holds the theology of it. In other words, the *acts* of John are apocryphal; perhaps the *theology* true. From the article "Gospels," in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, we learn that John is a late forgery at Ephesus, which may possibly preserve some historical traditions, though this cannot be proved. This article occupies in every way, however, a more cautious position than "Onesimus."

<sup>3</sup> "Onesimus," p. 283. <sup>4</sup> P. 273.

only an emasculated and harmonising Gospel, a Life of Christ which not only is founded on a contracted documentary basis, but which refuses to follow even that frankly; which, in short, first rejects most of the historical material and then reconstructs what it retained on the covert assumption that the supernatural, if not impossible, is at least incredible. We have before us, in other words, only another apocryphal Gospel, basing its facts on subjective feeling instead of historical testimony, and seeking to overturn in the interests of heresy the true account in the canonical books.

We do not care to pause in this brief essay to go into the theology of Philochristus; it must suffice to remark that it, too, is anti-supernaturalistic,<sup>1</sup> and while professing to see in Jesus both the Son of man and the Son of God, represents him not only as "verily a man in all points, sin only [but *not* errors, which are frequent] excepted,"<sup>2</sup> but also as mere man—perhaps something less than man. Dr. Abbott will not be found entirely consistent in other things. Though professing "to make no mention of any of the acts, nor of the long discourses, nor set dialogues, of that Gospel," he yet does frequently accept the testimony of John, both as to matters of action and teaching.<sup>3</sup> Though professing to substitute the true account for false accretions in the gospel history, he manufactures false accretions himself.<sup>4</sup> But in this he is always consistent: the supernatural is to him always a *σκάνδαλον*, and he will perform any mental gyration to be rid of it.

<sup>1</sup> Observe the treatment of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in "Philochristus," pp. 173, 175, 206, 305, 322, 337, 340, 349; whence it is difficult to believe that Dr. Abbott believes in his personality. As to the person of Christ, he apparently holds an extreme *Kenosis* view. Compare his doctrine of the Eucharist, p. 345, and his denial of the legitimacy of prayer for earthly things, p. 240.

<sup>2</sup> "Onesimus," p. 242.

<sup>3</sup> *E. g.*, p. 35, John baptizing at Bethany beyond Jordan; p. 198, his brothers did not believe in him; p. 204, the bread from heaven; p. 239, no man can come to him except the Father draw him; p. 258, "the Word of God"; p. 305, last promise, the Spirit; p. 308 (doubtingly), washing the disciples' feet; p. 322, one fold and one shepherd; p. 341, the waste of the ointment.

<sup>4</sup> It would require too much space to collect these: a sufficient number to justify the statement will come out incidentally in the text.

It was not by inadvertence that we observed that the effect of Dr. Abbott's attempt to give us a Christ in no respect more than man was to place before us a figure somewhat less than man. And if Dr. Abbott's reconstruction of the gospel history were not already condemned by its unhistorical method, it would be sufficiently condemned by the hideousness of the result. We may recognise in the frankly human Rabbi Jeshua a human being like ourselves—the true product of his times, as human as any gifted Jew of his day. But Philochristus's Lord differs from other men, but differs in such a direction that he commands our pity rather than our love and admiration. Why should we hesitate to say it?—the Jesus of "Philochristus" disturbs, pains, even disgusts, us. We turn away from him, feeling that we have been observing one mentally weak; the creature of circumstance, the prey of chance—not unlikely mentally diseased.

The cause of this painful effect is simply Dr. Abbott's unmeasured zeal to be rid of the supernatural, and the misfortune of his position that forces him to deal with it in detail and not, like the author of "Rabbi Jeshua," *en masse*. He carries this so far as to have set the task before him to account elaborately on natural [?] grounds for everything unusual or striking in Christ's life. Not only are his miracles explained away; not only are his prophecies reduced to prognostications, but his every act is arranged for beforehand, and he is not allowed to have even the usual foresight or the usual self-determination of the average man. The life is so triumphantly rid of all super-human elements, that it is almost rid of all super-physical ones as well, and the hero perilously approaches at times a state of imbecility, and never escapes that of a puppet moved by wires from without. Dr. Abbott no doubt had a hard and delicate task before him; his measure of success in it is only another proof, if another were needed, that to take away the divine Jesus, is to leave us no Jesus at all; that his whole life was so transfused with his divinity that it cannot be separated out from it without tearing with it the humanity too.

To justify what we have said, we need only to beg our readers to observe with us—it is a trial to observe it anew, even for a good purpose—that Dr. Abbott not only denies to Jesus any well-



considered plan, but represents him as driven hither and thither (to the distress and disgust of his followers), without purpose of his own, and always by impulse from without; not only denies to him any independent or consistent mental life, but makes him heavy, slow-minded, changeable, wavering, and ever the recipient, rather than the source, of mental impression. The Jesus of Dr. Abbott, in both act and thought, is always the creature of external circumstances; he neither acts for himself nor thinks for himself, and he receives the thoughts of others with visible effort. On his very first appearance on the page of the history,<sup>1</sup> he is made to exhibit his essentially hesitating and uncertain disposition. He is standing before a possessed boy, and Philochristus (not unnaturally) " marvelled at the manner of his dealing with the youth." " For, first of all, when he looked upon the youth, his face seemed swallowed up with pity; and then of a sudden it changed again; he stretched out his arm as one having authority, and as if on the point to bid the evil spirits depart; and this he did twice, but twice again he drew back his arm, as if changing his purpose. Then, at the last, the pity came back into his face all in an instant, so that his features seemed even melted therewith, and he stooped down and embraced the boy and kissed him, and, as I thought, he whispered words in his ear. But this I know not for certain; howbeit the boy, in any case, ceased from his raging, and no longer struggled, but lay still and quiet, only muttering and moaning a little." This was not, however, a cure, for subsequently<sup>2</sup> the same boy comes before us as a raving demoniac, and then, happily, is cured. We do not know how this narrative may strike our readers; to us it seems altogether like other apocryphal miracles, even in a literary point of view infinitely below those of the Gospels. Its purpose is to suggest the difficulty to Jesus of the task of healing; for, throughout Philochristus's narrative, as at Nazareth (p. 199), " he laid his hands on a few [only] that were sick of slight diseases and healed them, and even these not without labor." But it suggests, equally with that, the unsteady, uncertain, wavering will and hesitating purpose of Jesus.

---

<sup>1</sup> "Philochristus," p. 48.

<sup>2</sup> P. 98.

The same traits are made even more prominent in the healing of the Syro-Phœnician woman's daughter (p. 226); in the account of which the questions, which in the Gospel are questions of trial to the woman, are made questions of doubt in Jesus. "But he answered us, still not turning his face, 'I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.' Yet as he spake, he slackened his going, and spake, as it were, like unto one doubting somewhat and willing to have his words amended. Now came the woman in haste up to him and threw herself before his feet and said, 'Lord, help me!' Then Jesus stayed. Yet did he still keep his eyes fixed on that which he saw afar off, and for a brief space he was silent; but then he said, as though he were asking a question of his own soul, 'It is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it unto the dogs.' But the woman answered, 'Truth, O Master, yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from the master's table.' When Jesus heard these words, he turned his face straightway from the glory of the mountain and looked down on the woman; and behold he rejoiced more because of that which he beheld nigh unto him, than because of the glory that was afar off. For the fashion of his countenance was changed so as I cannot describe it. And immediately he stooped down and took the woman by the hand and raised her up and said unto her, 'O woman, great is thy faith; be it unto thee even as thou wilt.'" Neither was this, however, a cure; as the writer is careful to explain, the girl was healed not by the word of Christ, but by a word concerning Christ, "even at the mention of the name of Jesus"; not, then, by Jesus, but by herself and her vivid imagination and hopes; for all of which the way had been characteristically prepared, some two pages beforehand, by the anxious explanation that the mother had instilled into her afflicted daughter the hope of being healed by Jesus; an explanation now reiterated, lest it should be forgotten and Jesus be given some credit by the unwary reader. The whole effect of the conversation between Jesus and the woman went forth not from him to any one, but from her to him. "But when Jesus had heard the words of the Syro-Phœnician woman, he was *no longer* minded to journey towards the north" (p. 227). "For the faith of the Syro-Phœni-

cian had strangely moved him, *insomuch* that he spake as if the Redemption were nearer than it had been before" (p. 228). "But whether it had been revealed to our Master through the words of the Syro-Phœnician, . . . concerning this I know nothing; but Quartus judgeth that it was so" (p. 228). Now, this is not only *a* but *the* characteristic feature of the life of Christ according to Philochristus. The *Kenosis* doctrine of the person of Christ is sufficiently distasteful to us, but this is Kenotism run mad; and the mode in which the gradual revelation of his nature and mission is represented as coming to Jesus is intolerable. Everything is from without, and the reception of a thought by Jesus is attended with throes as if of parturition. John repeats a Psalm and "when he came to the words: 'Thou which hast shewed me great and sore troubles, shalt give me life again and shalt bring me up from the depths of the earth;' then indeed the face of Jesus kindled with a marvellous light and he bade John cease. But he himself sat still musing, and his lips moved like unto one repeating the same words over and over again: 'Thou shalt bring me up again from the depths of the earth'" (p. 198). So the thought of a resurrection first dawned on his mind. Once again, the disciples were quoting Scripture and one of them said: "God will provide himself a lamb for the burnt-offering." "And at these words" "the countenance of Jesus changed as if he had heard some new word of God" and "he began at this time to see clearly that he must needs die for Israel, even as" [but apparently only as] "John the son of Zachariah had died" (p. 205). Even a *twit* brought revelations: when they wished to make him king, Jesus took no heed thereof, until one threw himself in the way, crying that "it was better for a man to lose his life as John the Prophet had lost it, than to save it as Jesus desired to save it. Thereat Jesus stayed for an instant and lifted his eyes from the ground; howbeit not in anger, but rather as he is wont to do . . . whensoever he heareth a Voice of God" (p. 191). The reader must guard himself, however, from imagining that Dr. Abbott wishes to represent Jesus as a second Socrates in these allusions to a "Voice of God;" no voice came to Jesus save through the external medium of a fellow-man's words, for Jesus was original

in nothing—never the leader, but always the led. He was not a second Socrates, then, only because he was less than Socrates.

Nor is this uncertainty, indecision, and painful insufficiency confined to his teaching only. In small and great affairs alike Philochristus's Jesus never knows what to do, and greatly tries his followers (if such a term may be used) by his aimless and visibly baffled behavior. The "shadow of doubt and expectancy" that clouded his brow never left him. It is impossible not to sympathise with the little body of weary disciples, dragged back and forth without purpose or result, at every hint of danger or freak of restlessness. No wonder that "some of them murmured concerning their many flights and wanderings" (p. 208); that "they accompanied him sorely against their will" (p. 224), and it seemed to them that there was no end to such flittings. No wonder that "the manner of Jesus . . . disquieted them and made some of them doubt," as "he appeared like unto one waiting for a message and marvelling somewhat that the message came not" (p. 224). It must have been weary work indeed! Not that Dr. Abbott fails to not only suggest but assign a reason for every movement. Now it is a light "held up by night in Tiberias (on I know not what report or rumor of some danger intended to Jesus by Herod, or some marching forth of the Thracian guard)" (p. 224); now any mere report of impending danger (p. 208), and a restless aimless seeking of "a revelation" on the part of Jesus; but always some special and momentary impulse. How different the Gospels! or Mark! or the "Triple Tradition"! There, all is order and settled, wisely-laid, and firmly-held plan. Jesus adapts his movements to the requirements of his work and every movement stands out lucidly as part of a great and accomplishing purpose—he bends circumstances to his will, and makes his very enemies work out his plans. Here he is but a feather in the grasp of the wind and drifts about at the pleasure of any one who will kindly supply a little motive power. There he attains a lofty independence of thought and action never attained by another son of man; here he is the most painfully dependent actor an account of whom history has preserved.

So eager is Philochristus to exclude every possibility of superhuman knowledge in Jesus that he elaborately explains beforehand every source of his knowledge, even of the most natural and minute facts. He would not, for the world, omit telling us, for instance, that Jesus saw Zaccheus in the tree (p. 291) as he passed, or that he was—somewhat startlingly and painfully—a hearer of his disciples' dispute as to preëminence (p. 266). He tells us (inconsistently quoting John) that Jesus "knew what was in man" (p. 280). But what notion he can attach to the phrase it puzzles us to make out. Jesus is jealously guarded by him from any exhibition of either forecast of acts, or insight into character. Even to the end he knows not whom to trust, nor what to do, save as guided and instructed by more sagacious friends. No more pitiable account of Jesus' last days, we are persuaded, has ever been penned than is here given to us, in this interest. It is due to a suggestion from Matthew that he rides into Jerusalem on an ass, for, as they entered Bethphage, Matthew saw an ass, and remembering, repeated the well-known prophecy. "Now Jesus overheard these words but said nothing; yet, as it seemed to me, he took note thereof" (p. 307). Accordingly he sent Matthew and a companion next day after the ass. It was due to an arrangement of Jesus' own that the multitudes met him with hosannahs as he entered the city. For "Jesus gave command . . . that certain of the disciples should go before the rest into Jerusalem, even to our friends and companions there, for to instruct them concerning the time of the going down of Jesus, that they might come forth to meet us" (pp. 307, 312). And yet in the midst of all these preparations he had not even yet a plan of action: "rather, he was as one waiting and expecting, looking perchance for some sign of the will of the Lord" (p. 313). He approached the gate of the city still "rapt in other matters; even as if he heard not the shouting nor the singing, neither understood the meaning thereof" (p. 315); his "countenance was wistful" and "there seemed, as it were, a shadow of doubt and expectancy upon his face" (p. 315). Yet when at length the Pharisees fairly drag his attention to the shouting multitudes he sees in their hosannahs, "the very voice of the Father in

Heaven speaking by his little ones on earth and showing unto him how there must be no sign of fire from heaven" (p. 316). So!—and so he was expecting *this*—and it was due only to this accident that he learned even at this late date not to expect it. It was not Jesus but Joseph of Aramathea, whose forecast of danger kept Jesus a day or two in quiet at Bethany; and whose skill it was which prepared the secret chamber for the passover and gave the secret sign for its discovery (p. 331). Nay, so little insight had Jesus into the character of men, that although he allowed himself to be led in this matter by Joseph, he had actually chosen Judas to be the medium of communication with him and was prevented from betraying all only by an accident (p. 338), and that accident was Judas's unexpected absence in conference with the priests. It was due only to instruction from others that he came at last to suspect Judas (p. 339). Even at the very end, the poor creaking machinery enters: it was only because a hasty and terrified messenger from Joseph pressed into the room that Jesus led his disciples from the passover-chamber; and once out he stood helpless, in characteristic but most painful perplexity. Can a more appalling spectacle be imagined than this poor hunted and harmless man standing there in the midnight street, in the midst of disciples depending on him for guidance (why they should continue to do so, who can tell?) "looking up to the sky" (p. 348). "First he made two or three steps towards the temple and the tower of Antonia"—"but then," his nobler impulse giving way, he turned in flight "towards the gate that leadeth to the vale of Kidron," evidently intending to seek safety in Bethany. A messenger meets him with information that his enemies beset the road (p. 352), and so ("therefore" says our author unhesitatingly) he turned aside to Gethsemane. There Judas found him. Alas! this poor timid hunted man is not the Jesus of history, and cannot be either the Lord of our souls or the founder of the Christian faith. To Philochristus also we must say: "You have taken away our Lord."

No one would expect such a Jesus as this to work miracles; and if Dr. Abbott started with this conception of the Master, we do not at all wonder that he felt bound to explain away the mira-

cles. Apart from this, his success as a "naturaliser" is not striking. First of all, he tries to limit the miracles to cases of healing. "Once only," we are told, "did Jesus so much as appear to adventure to alter the course of the world" (p. 235), and "methinks," it is added, "even here he did it only in appearance." In other words, Jesus' bidding the storm cease is entirely parallel—the comparison is Philochristus's own—with Cæsar's calming the frightened boatmen with the assurance that they bore quite too precious freight for the storm to overwhelm. We turn with mingled amazement and amusement from Philochristus's two pages to the few lines of the Triple Tradition: "*Let us go across to the other side. They took Hi(m) in a boat. They wak(e) Hi(m), say(ing), We perish: and he arising rebuked the win(d). And there was a calm. He said to them, Your faith! They said, 'Who is this that even the wind obey(eth) Him?' "*"<sup>1</sup> One would like to know who, behind this simple narrative, has favored Dr. Abbott with more accurate information. The raising of Jairus's daughter he accounts for by the remark: "All men *supposing* her to be dead" (p. 233). The miracles of the walking on the water and of the loaves and fishes—about both of which the "Triple Tradition" is perfectly explicit—are elaborately explained as misunderstood tropes. It is by such methods that he reduces all miracles to cases of healing. Next he limits the diseases healed: "As thou knowest, Jesus doth not adventure to heal all afflictions and all diseases. And even if the affliction be such as can be healed, yet he healeth not except there be first faith" (p. 147). "Then he passed along the ranks of the sick people; and wheresoever he perceived that any could be healed, he laid his hands on them, and lo! they were at once freed from their infirmities; and many unclean spirits were driven out from those that were possessed. Now, most of them that were healed had been possessed with evil spirits; but others were lunatic, or sick of the palsy, or of fever, or had impediments in

<sup>1</sup> Encyclopædia Britannica, ed. Stoddard, p. 705b. We quote from the Encyclopædia Britannica, inasmuch as we wish to use Dr. Abbott's own version of the Triple Tradition, and the little work recently published by him and Mr. Rashbrooke has not yet come to our hand.

their speech. But Jesus had a marvellous power to discern, methought, not only them that had faith from them that had not, but also such diseases as were to be cured from such as were not to be cured, because it was not prepared for him that he should cure them" (p. 100). We need not pause to point out how diverse this is from the few and simple words of the "Triple Tradition," for which it is substituted (*cf.* Mark i. 32-34), nor to ask what Onesimus would have thought of these accretions could he have seen them. Next, Dr. Abbott is careful to make the cures that he allows usually gradual and always difficult to Jesus, as has been already illustrated; and then uses his best endeavors to reduce most of them to the casting out of demöns. A good deal of space is then devoted to an exposition of the nature of possession. It is traced to malaria (p. 42), and this judgment supported by an array of invented "facts," while no attempt is made to shield Jesus from the effects of the inevitable inference that he partook in or countenanced so gross a superstition. As the upshot of the whole matter, we cannot see why Carlyle's description of the Irvingites might not serve equally well as Dr. Abbott's description of Christ and his companions: were they not also a batch of "hysterical women and crack-brained enthusiasts"? and do not the words equally apply: "They also pretend to 'work miracles,' and have raised more than one weak bed-rid woman, and cured people of 'nerves,' or, as they themselves say, 'cast devils out of them' "?<sup>1</sup>

After the instances that have been incidentally given, it will not be necessary to give any extended examples of Dr. Abbott's dealing with individual miracles. It is enough to note for comparison with "Rabbi Jeshua" that he explains the healing of the Gadarene by supposing that the deluded man fancied in his ravings that he had a legion of swine in him, and that Jesus had ordered them back into "the abyss" (p. 133). It is not uninteresting to trace the growth of Dr. Abbott's confidence in this explanation. He first suggested it in "Through Nature to Christ," on the strength of a passage in the "Arabic Gospel of the Infancy," which declared of a demoniac who had been exor-

---

<sup>1</sup> Letter to his Mother, of October 20, 1831.



cised that "demons, in the shape of crows and serpents, began to go forth, fleeing out of his mouth."<sup>1</sup> When he wrote the article "Gospels," he thought it "perhaps more likely" that the story was entirely unhistorical, inasmuch as the names "Gadara," "Gerasene," and "Gergesa" might all be significant. In "Philochristus" he returns to his first guess. And in "Onesimus" (pp. 97-99) he makes Artimidorus discuss the matter at length, and elaborately illustrate and explain the origin of the "legend" on this supposition. It is needless to observe that there is no proof that such stories as that in the "Arabic Gospel of the Infancy" were current in Christ's time; that if they were, there is nothing to connect them with this narrative, which does not represent the swine as coming forth from the man; and that the "Triple Tradition" on this occurrence is thoroughly simple as to the main matter involved.

The resurrection of our Lord presents an especially difficult matter for Dr. Abbott to handle. Mark's Gospel ends abruptly at the empty tomb, and Dr. Abbott is on record as believing that Mark ends here "because the common [or triple] tradition ended here, and because he scrupled to add anything to the notes and traditions which he knew to rest on higher authority than his own."<sup>2</sup> (Oh that Dr. Abbott had either granted to Mark the benefit of his judgment—"if this be true, it stamps with the seal of a higher authority such traditions as have been preserved to us by so scrupulous a writer"—or imitated him at least in his scrupulousness!) Like "Rabbi Jeshua," then, "Philochristus" should have left us standing before an empty grave—to draw our own inferences. But Philochristus chose to be "here unlike himself" (p. 412) and "to depart from his usual course" and subscribe himself a witness to the Lord's "resurrection." Not that Dr. Abbott believes in a "resurrection"; he apparently follows Keim in spiritualising the fact away while retaining the name, and thus makes Onesimus (p. 110), after careful inquiry, say:

<sup>1</sup> Note the literary skill with which Dr. Abbott prepares for such explanations in "Philochristus" by prefixing an admirably written narrative of a similar exorcism at page 44.

<sup>2</sup> Encyc. Brit., art. "Gospels."

“The sum of all seems to be that the body of Christus was not indeed raised from the grave—for that were against all course of nature; and besides, if it had been so, why was the Tradition silent on the proofs of so great a wonder?—but that some kind of image or phantasm of the mind represented him to his followers after his decease.” Thus he has no recourse save to the worn-out vision hypothesis, and we are condemned to see again all the Christian world—Paul most elaborately<sup>1</sup>—made out to be a pack of “crack-brained enthusiasts” or weak-minded visionaries, it matters little which you call them. The theory is discussed in “Onesimus,” but to Philochristus is committed the task of giving it force by clothing it with a life-like narrative. But in his way, as in the way of others before him, a twofold difficulty stood: he must make universal vision-seeing appear natural, and he must gain a fair and natural starting-point for the vision-seeing. In the former matter he has fared about as ill as his predecessors. To account for the empty tomb, he suggests the removal of the body by the authorities (p. 375). To gain time, he does away with the historical “third day,” elaborately explaining away Christ’s prediction, and apparently forgetting Paul’s testimony, and puts most of the visions at a long distance of time after Christ’s death. And the only effect on the reader of the multiplication of the visionaries is here, too, an increasing sense of the unreality and impossibility of the whole account. In order to gain a starting-point for the visions—we are speaking now calmly and advisedly—Philochristus sinks to the lowest device ever yet adventured by critic or “apocryphalist.” It was bad enough for Celsus to rail that the belief that Jesus had risen originated in the ravings of a half-mad woman, or for Renan to seize the hint and elaborate it into his famous chapter that makes it the creation of a grateful woman’s love. Dr. Abbott actually dares to trace it back to the frenzy of a traitor’s remorse, and to propagate it thence through a bereft follower’s dreams. We repeat it—for we hope our readers will have difficulty in crediting it—just as Caracalla’s remorseful fancy pictured his mur-

---

<sup>1</sup> “Onesimus,” p. 243.

dered brother's wraith as continually pursuing him, so Judas's remorse pictured the betrayed Jesus on his track, and THIS was the origin of the faith in the resurrection of their Lord which brought peace back to the hearts and glorified the lives of the youthful Christian community. We prefer transcribing the terrible passage to abstracting it:

"As one in a dream, scarce knowing what I did, I bent my way towards the gate of the valley of Kidron. Here I was musing how but yesterday, in this very place, I had walked by the side of Jesus, even at his right hand, and how the touch of his arm had held me up in my stumbling; when behold, I started back as if I had seen a spirit. For the voice of one close to me in the twilight whispered with an hissing sound, 'He is not dead.' I looked, and behold! Judas stood before me. His face was pale and his eyes glared, and passion so wrought his features that they moved and quivered, as if against his will, like unto the features of one possessed by Satan. When I drew back from him, at first he would have stayed me; but seeing that I loathed him, he also drew back and said. 'Nay, be not afraid; I cannot betray another. But he is not dead. Hast thou not seen him?' I marvelled at him, but said nothing, only shaking my head. Then Judas replied, 'Think not that I have slain him; he liveth; he hunteth me to death; these three times have I seen him. I have not slain him. Why, then, doth he yet hunt me? But thou, thou didst love him; he thou at peace with me.' Saying these words, he came forward again to have taken me by the hand; but I could not. Then he turned away and laughed such a laugh as I pray God I may never hear again. But as he departed, he cried aloud, 'Thou rememberest his words, "It were better for him that he had never been born": verily he was a prophet.' Then he laughed again, even such another laugh as before; and he cursed the God that made him. With that he went his way, and I saw him no more.

"For awhile I stood where I was, as if in a trance, almost expecting that the words of Judas should prove true, and that Jesus should come forth to me out of the air around me. Then I passed through the gate of Kidron, and crossing the brook, I began to go out by the way which leadeth to Bethany. But even as I went up the mountain, I pondered over the words of Judas, 'He is not dead; I have seen him,' for I could not forget them, nor put them out of my mind, and behold, whithersoever I looked in the twilight, all things bore witness unto Jesus and seemed to say the same words, 'We have seen him; he is not dead' " (pp. 366, 367).

From this beginning grew everything! Surely, we may close the self-refuted book in silence. Do we not rightly judge that a

book which presents such a picture of Christ as this does, does not need refutation; that a book which seriously proposes to found the belief in Christ's resurrection in the ravings of a crazed murderer does not deserve refutation?

MR. HART'S "AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF JUDAS."<sup>1</sup>

The passage is easy from a reconstruction of the life of Christ which assigns to Judas so important a function as the origination of the legend of the resurrection of his Master, to a formal autobiography of Judas himself, though the transition is otherwise marked enough, and we need to apologise to Mr. Hart for having brought his book into such company. For although in scholarship and literary character Mr. Hart's book is far below Dr. Abbott's, in reverence and truth it is far above them; and although Mr. Hart has not escaped the invention of some apocryphal details and rationalising explanations—some of them offensive—here and there<sup>2</sup> his book founds itself on the frank admission of the trustworthiness of our Gospels and seldom strays from them. Some of these sins, as well as some of those of omission, may be fitly explained, moreover, by the circumstance that the narrative is placed in the mouth of Judas, who neither knew all that Christ did or said, nor can be deemed incapable of occasional rationalism. It is a small matter that we cannot confess to have found the literary form which Mr. Hart has adopted sustained throughout. It is of more importance that we feel obliged to confess that, to our mind, he fails in its main purpose, and neither gives us a consistent and credible account of Judas's career, nor solves the problem of his motive in his treason. The sentimental ruffian, introspective scoundrel, and immoral moral-

<sup>1</sup> *The Autobiography of Judas Iscariot, a Character Study.* By the Rev. James W. T. Hart, M. A. London: Kegan Paul & Co., 1884.

<sup>2</sup> *E. g.*, p. 51, where the details of the process of the reanimation of the widow's son are given with the effect of losing the majesty of the narrative and suggesting a dubious theory of the working of Jesus' miraculous power; p. 70, where the need of deliberation in Jesus is needlessly asserted; p. 79, as to the process of recovery in the Gergesene; p. 101, where a sentimental reason is given for the feeding of the five thousand, etc.

iser here held up to our view, seems to us a psychological impossibility; the man who could have written as Mr. Hart makes Judas write would have been capable of any mean villainy, except just that which he makes Judas commit; and we are not surprised that he plainly does not himself know whether he is writing a journal, a history, or a sermon, whether for his own sole eye or for his contemporaries or posterity. As for the motives of his treachery, we are grateful to Mr. Hart that he has not followed the rationalists and made a pet of the betrayer, and set himself to exhibit the sinlessness, if not nobility, of his action. But beyond that we cannot praise his effort to untangle the skein of his motives, still less to trace the evolution of his purpose. We do not, indeed, doubt that fear for himself, anger at his Master for his reproofs, and, above all, cupidity for wealth entered into his motives; but the Fourth Gospel much more satisfactorily exhibits the matter than Mr. Hart, and the introduction of outraged Messianic hopes only complicates instead of explaining the problem. Judas, like Satan, requires a Milton for his analyser, the evil that is in such men is pitched in a key of immensity, and is far less complex in its origin and outlets than we are inclined to think. The simple account of the Fourth Gospel stands, at all events, still as not only the most consistent and likely, but the sole probable one. Whatever other motives beyond what are there uncovered, entered into his Satanic purpose, we may be sure pierced it only as veins of ore pierce a mountain, and we but confuse our minds when we direct attention to them. Great evil, like great good, is apt to be simple; and the divine truth that, if the eye be single, the whole body shall be full of light, undoubtedly has its evil counterpart.

Mr. Hart warns us not to regard his little book as in any sense a life or study or history of Christ. We regret that we cannot help it. In the nature of the case, it is an apocryphal Gospel conceived from the standpoint—not indeed of Mr. Hart—but of Judas. It is an *εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ἰουδᾶ*. We rejoice, however, that we are exonerated from criticising it as a presentation of the history of Jesus, by the circumstance that, in the intention of the author himself, it does not stand for truth. It is professedly a

partial, broken, and incomplete view of the history, such a view as might be taken by a Judas, such a view as might be taken and yet the soul be lost; and yet a view which, just because recognising the essential facts of the history as facts, comes far nearer the truth than either of the books we have been criticising. Mr. Hart follows Stier in holding that Judas did not see even in his remorse that Jesus was more than the "Son of man," and failed of the knowledge of his sonship to God, which the Spirit only subsequently brought fully to the minds of his followers. It may be so; certainly it is overwhelmingly probable that Judas did not consciously betray the Lord God himself. "They sinned ignorantly, through unbelief." Alas! that men to-day, after the Resurrection, after Pentecost, after the fuller revelations of the Spirit through the apostles, can still be found who can take a Judas-view of the Son of God! "I tell you that if the mighty works that are done in thee had been done in Sodom and Gomorrah, they had repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes."

DR. CLARKE'S "LEGEND OF THOMAS DIDYMUS."<sup>1</sup>

It is interesting to observe how much more natural Jesus appears as seen through Mr. Hart's "Judas," despite its partial view, than as seen through Dr. Abbott's "Philochristus." It is a paradox, no doubt, but historic truth no less, that nothing is more entirely unnatural than the unnaturally natural Jesus that rationalism from Paulus down has invented for the wonder of the puzzled world, while in proportion as his supernatural character is admitted does Jesus appear historically natural. This great truth is illustrated again in Dr. Clarke's "Legend of Thomas Didymus." We are struck at once on opening it with the comparative naturalness of the Jesus it presents to us above the Jesus of "Rabbi Jeshua" or "Philochristus." And the reason lies open to every eye: "I am unable," says the preface, "to read the story without the conviction that Jesus possessed some extraordinary power over nature and life" (p. viii.); and accordingly,

<sup>1</sup> *The Legend of Thomas Didymus the Jewish Sceptic.* By James Freeman Clarke, etc. Boston: Lee & Shepard; New York: Charles T. Dillingham, 1881.

throughout the book, Jesus appears endowed with superhuman—no, preternatural—or at least unusual power and wisdom, and thus stands somewhat naturally in the place in the world's history which Jesus confessedly occupied. Above all, it is impossible to deny the resurrection of Christ and retain any historical probability; the life of Jesus, reduced to its lowest dimensions, demands the resurrection as its natural and necessary crown—the course of subsequent history rationalised to its extreme limit demands it as its root. It is actually easier to contend (with Loman, for instance) that there was no Jesus, than, admitting his existence, to deny his resurrection. It is a homage which all historical studies must pay to truth, on pain of betraying their origin in a non-natural and philosophising fancy, that they must frankly own the resurrection of Christ to have actually occurred. Here we see another reason for the stronger impression of probability which Dr. Clarke's Jesus makes on the reader's mind. Dr. Clarke says: "The main fact that Jesus after his death came again to his disciples in visible form, and created a faith in immortality which transformed their whole being, seems to me undeniable. . . . With all respect for those who believe that the apostles imagined that they saw their Master and that this self-illusion was the foundation on which the religion was built which converted Europe to faith in a Jewish Messiah, the supposition appears to me historically incredible. The house which is to stand must be founded on the rock of reality, not on the sand of delusion." (P. x.) Accordingly, in the history itself, Dr. Clarke represents the resurrection of Christ as an actual and very real occurrence. Now this is a great advance over the books we have hitherto had before us; and it is apparent that Dr. Clarke's historical conception of Jesus and the nature of the work he did must be very far above that of either "Rabbi Jeshua" or "Philochristus."

The influence of his truer historical sense becomes apparent again in his dealing with "the written books of the Gospel" as "Onesimus" calls them. In his hands, at last, John's Gospel obtains recognition, and the immense weight of the historical demonstration of the genuineness of our Gospels appears to be felt by him.

We must not leave the impression that his attitude towards or dealing with the narrative is altogether satisfactory; we only mean to say it is far more satisfactory than that of the other apocrypha we have been discussing. He admits that the books sprang from their traditionally reputed authors, although John's was actually penned (from his lips) by an Ephesian scribe; that they are authentic, genuine, and historically credible. The coloring of the narrative they give is not, however, treated as altogether trustworthy—perhaps Dr. Clarke would express it by saying that he does not hold them to be inerrant. Such passages as the following, which are not infrequent, will illustrate his dealing with the history:

“Near the road we saw a fig tree, which seemed full of fruit, and we went towards it to gather some of the figs; but what appeared like fruit were indeed dry leaves, for the fig tree was dying of drought or disease. Then I saw Jesus lift his eyes towards the city and the temple, on which the sun had just arisen, and he said sadly, ‘No one shall again eat thy fruit.’ Afterwards, Matthew and Simon” [*i. e.*, of course the Gospels of Matthew and Mark] “said that he had cursed the fig tree; but to me it appeared that he was speaking of Jerusalem, and that the barren fig tree had seemed to him a type of the nation which would not bring forth fruit to God. The next morning, when we passed that way again, the fig tree had withered almost wholly away, which caused Matthew to say that Jesus had cursed it and wrought a marvel to destroy it. But Jesus answered, ‘Verily I say unto you that if we have faith and do not doubt in our heart, we could lift this mountain and cause it to fall into the sea.’ And the disciples thought he spoke of the Mount of Olives. . . . but I . . . believe that he meant that their prejudice was as great as a mountain, preventing them from receiving the truth. He therefore was praying to God for power to roll away that mountain from their souls. . . . I suppose, therefore, that his disciples were mistaken in this, and did not see the Master's meaning” (p. 343).

“The Pharisees had everywhere circulated a report that Jesus could not be the Messiah who was to come, because he was not descended from David. . . . In answer to this, some of the preachers of the gospel” [represented by Matthew and Luke] “produced genealogies from the archives of the Levites, which were carefully kept in every city, to show that the Master was indeed descended from David, both by the father and mother. My brother Paul laughed at this, and said that whether Jesus was descended from David or not was of no moment, inasmuch as he was declared to be the Son of God with power, by the descent from



death into a higher life. Paul exhorted his disciples not to pay any attention to these endless genealogies and old-wives' fables. Nor, indeed, did Jesus claim any such outward descent from David, but rather declared that the Messiah ought not to be called David's son, since he was greater than David and the Master of David. . . . He did not say, 'Verily my mother and father are both descended from David, as your genealogies will show; and in truth I was not born at Nazareth, but at Bethlehem, the city of David.' Instead of this, he showed that the Coming One would not be a son of David" (pp. 354, 355).

Just so with reference to John's Gospel: it is taught that it was taken down from John's lips, somewhat piecemeal, and that the papers are "not well arranged," "because John himself, not having read them, did not see how they were placed together; for if he had, he would have altered the arrangement" (p. 367). Yet "in John's mind there are no joints, no fitting of one truth to the rest; each stands alone. Hence it easily happens that he may not have given his narrations to the scribe in any proper order, and they may sometimes be put in wrong places" (p. 374). It can be easily seen that by such dealing as this room is left for a considerable reconstruction of the history and a considerable number of rationalising explanations, which Dr. Clarke does not fail to take advantage of.

The way being thus opened for his doctrinal prepossessions and dislike of too much miracle to sway his judgment as to historical details, Dr. Clarke's actual history falls far below what his historical sense should have made it. As an actual historian, too, he fails still more through two more far-reaching faults: defective scholarship and insufficient literary sense. As a piece of literature, the "Legend of Thomas Didymus" is, indeed, somewhat of a marvel. We have not been able to persuade ourselves to undertake seriously its higher criticism; but a cursory reading suggests to us that it might be quite possible to prove that it was written piecemeal, with different purposes and on different plans, and then patched together into one whole—if the result can be called a whole—as an afterthought. Apparently at one time Dr. Clarke intended to compose a "Life of Christ" in a series of letters from various personages, and while he conveyed in them an account of the essential facts, at the same time to work out the

varied conceptions of Jesus' work and person which would naturally be taken by typical representatives of the several classes of the day. This would have given us a book founded somewhat on the method of the well-known works of Dr. Ingraham. The letters, apparently written in the prosecution of this plan, have been incorporated into the narrative of Christ's life, given by Thomas the Doubter to his Indian parishioners, somewhat confusedly and sometimes rather startlingly. The reader comes suddenly on letters of "Epinetus," "Ben Tabbai," Pilate's wife, or on the journal of Nicodemus, and wonders if the binder has carelessly sewn in leaves from another volume. The literary character of these letters is higher than that of the main narrative, and they appear to have been much more carefully, perhaps lovingly, composed. Indeed, Dr. Clarke does not seem to have been intended by nature as a writer of romances. We trust we may be forgiven for saying that we scarcely remember coming in any novel on so laughable a love scene as that between Miriam and Thomas; and Miriam's general vacuity and empty twaddle throughout the whole first section of the book is quite intolerable. Dr. Clarke's didactic purpose, again, has clashed with the needs of his romance. Thomas becomes worse than a lay figure in this interest, and a most innocent inquirer after just the information that Dr. Clarke wishes to communicate to his readers, in defiance of all the probabilities of his own situation. Thus he is as objective in speaking of his own people as a modern Sunday-school scholar (p. 40). He tells us himself, at page 26, that he had already "listened to the learned Rabbis," and yet he asks, at page 41, with the most charming show of interest, what "putting a fence around the law means," and, even after that, it is not until page 59 that he has ever seen or heard of a *Pharisee*. He first hears of the existence of the Book of Job at page 68—and the reader wishes he had remained in ignorance still longer, for Dr. Clarke takes occasion to insert at once a long and tiresome analysis of the book, occupying some eleven pages. He understands Greek, at page 81, and listens to Philo's lectures (does Dr. Clarke suppose that Philo lectured in Hebrew?), and yet has to learn Greek at page 96. He had lived in Jerusalem some

years, and yet never heard of Rachel's tomb till he takes a journey to the Dead Sea, at page 113. The climax is capped when in the most engaging simplicity he writes, quite in the strain of a modern tourist, an account of a journey taken with a broken heart as companion. These are only a few samples of what one finds every page or two, in the first half of the book especially. Even greater confusion is wrought by a queer habit of assuming that all of Christ's sayings were spoken more than once, and by repeating the most advanced of them at both the beginning and ending of his life, with the effect of destroying all growth in his teaching and hopelessly jumbling the chronology. Even the very nomenclature is strangely varied. Jesus, for instance, is indifferently Jesus, Joshua-bar-Joseph, and Joshua-bar-Yosheph; the name John appears now as John, now Johann, now Johanan, and anon Yochannan. Dr. Clarke tells us that he has gone over the book "several times with care." What, then, is the reason that such literary blemishes are left so thickly strewn over his pages? that he has allowed his book to leave his hand in a form that places it as a piece of literature well below all the others we have before us? The marks of defective scholarship we shall not attempt to illustrate; they are pervasive, and have not only to do with numerous points of detail, but also with the general tone of the book, and even the authorities relied on. Nor do we care to stay to point out such small slips as that, *e. g.*, by which circumcision is made a temple instead of a household ordinance (p. 53), and Thomas an elaborately educated man—both in conflict with New Testament testimony. We are glad to say that there is a marked improvement in both matter and style at the point where the narrative leaves the "*Zeitgeschichte*," and comes to the life of Christ proper.

We have hinted that Dr. Clarke's dogmatic prepossessions occasionally show themselves. We rejoice that they do not entirely overlay his book and that we have the edifying spectacle of a pronounced Unitarian dealing more soberly with the life of our Lord than works that come to us out of the bosom of the great Church of England. But Dr. Clarke's theology has none the less affected his whole understanding of the story of Jesus'

life; and we fear we must say has led him into some very unedifying dealing with its records. It would have been far better for him to have frankly taken his stand by the side of his co-religionist, Dr. Ellis, and admitted that the Christian records are imbued with "orthodoxy," and are therefore false; far more consistent, though no less unhistorical. Dr. Clarke stops at no rationalising to rid the history of the marks and confessions of Jesus' divinity. Let such passages as the following witness: "I asked him once why he forbade us to tell of all his goodness. And he said, 'Call not me good; none is good save God'" (p. 125). "And when they all cried aloud, and blessed him, he said, 'Bless God, not man; for every good gift is from him'" (p. 133). "Her love is great because her sin having been great, I have brought to her pardon from God" (p. 146). When the paralytic was healed, Jesus said, "'You think it easy to say to this man, 'Thy sins are forgiven,' but not easy to know if they are forgiven. You think that God alone can forgive sins. That is true, but God can give power to man to carry his divine love to other men'" (p. 196). "'Yes, God is my Father; but he is also your Father. . . . Do I boast when I say I am his son? No. . . . Each man is 'the son' to whom the Father says 'my child.' . . . Each one is 'the son' to whom the Father gives spiritual life. . . . As soon as ye are sons ye can raise dead men to life'" (p. 263). "But one said, 'We do not stone thee for thy good works, but because it is blasphemy for a man to make himself God.' Jesus replied, 'It is true I call God my Father; he is my Father, and your Father also when you love him and trust in him. . . . If I *had* called myself God, being a man, I should only do what Moses did. But I do not call myself God, but son of God'" (p. 273). "'I said not that I had seen Abraham, but that Abraham had seen me. Long before Abraham was born, I was chosen in the counsels of God to be what I am'" (p. 274). "He could not let himself be called 'good,' since all goodness flows . . . from God" (p. 298). "'I and my Father are indeed one, . . . all who love God are one with him'" (p. 318). "'Do not look at me,' he said, 'but look through me at him who sent me. For when ye see me, ye see not me but him'" (p. 360). "And Jesus said,

'How canst thou be with me, Philip, without seeing the Father? Dost thou not see that I am always with him and that he is always with me?' Thus, my children, when ye look in a lake, ye see the sun, because the lake reflects the sun, and so when ye look to Jesus, ye see the Father, because God is reflected in that heavenly spirit" (p. 371). "I had found my Master; I had also found my God; for I saw that the goodness and truth of my Master had not been suffered to go down in vain. I once again saw the God of justice and love protecting and guiding all things. Thus, in a moment, I had found my Master; and, in finding him, through him I had found his God and mine. All I could say was, 'MY MASTER AND MY GOD'" (p. 439). Dr. Clarke's further doctrinal prepossessions also show themselves, especially his denial of any true atonement or any second coming of Christ or general resurrection. We shall not stop, however, to illustrate how he manages to deny these things. What we have already given will suffice for our purpose, which was twofold: to point out how often Dr. Clarke is swayed by prejudice rather than by historical considerations, and how elaborate some of his misexplanations are, involving further that they are *conscious* efforts. An intellectual honesty that will despise such things appears to us one of the chief wants of the age.

Some of the passages we have quoted already hint to us how Dr. Clarke tries to make miracles easy to him, and why we have hesitated to say he admits the superhuman, supernatural, or even the preternatural into his narrative. So sure is Dr. Clarke that Jesus is only man that he wishes miracles, too, to appear within the powers of humanity. The text of his message on this matter is simply that miracles are not beyond human power, if only humanity could retain its proper powers. Let us, however, illustrate his conception of the matter from his own words. "Whatever Jesus did, was done so easily and peacefully that it all seemed to belong to the very movement of nature. When I saw Peter thus moving over the waves, it looked natural and as that which any one might do. . . . I thought how often in my dreams I had seemed to myself . . . [as if] . . . I could float without wings in the air. Perhaps, indeed, such dreams are a prophecy

of the time to come when the laws of lightness and weight will be understood and men will be able to learn how to destroy for a time the weight of their bodies" (p. 181). It was the compassion of the Master which "drew forth in him this strange human faculty. I call it human, for all his actions were human—either such as men do now or may do hereafter" (p. 181). He proceeds to explain that in this Jesus was simply "the type and perfect model of what man ought to be," just as the one perfect oak in a grove of stunted oaks is the true type of oaks. He is consequently never tired of speaking of miracle-working as "part of the order of nature" (p. 184); as a natural power (p. 185); "as no violent incursion of the power of God, but a vast unfolding of the powers latent in man" (p. 193), which may take thousands of years to unfold in other men, but which some time may be the heritage of all. So, too, when the voice of thunder answered Jesus at his call, this was natural: "I thought that he indeed needed no voice, but that the heavens and earth sympathised with every great event and that whosoever needed a voice from heaven would have it" (p. 359). It is even elaborately explained how this power of miracle-working is attained, in words professing to come from Jesus himself: "He told us, moreover, how when he lived thus close to God, not only the truth and love of his Father came and dwelt in him, but also the power of the Father. Nature in all her parts became submissive to his will. He had only to wish strongly, and the sick man arose and walked; with a word he could release the madman and lunatic from their bitter bondage; with a word cause the plague of leprosy to flee away. Yet he knew that all this power was not his own, but his Father's, and to be used only for the good of the Father's other children, and to cause the kingdom of love and truth to come" (p. 212). In one passage even a spiritualistic theory of the working of the physical powers of nature is hinted at as possible (p. 192). Even the raising of the dead may be a purely human work: "The limits between life and death—when life is just departed—are not to be known" (p. 193). "Who can tell when seeming death is real death? And may not death itself in its beginnings be arrested by the same hidden power of the soul which can conquer and dispel disease? There-

fore . . . I could . . . believe, and yet believe that this was no violent incursion of the power of God, but a vast unfolding of powers latent in man. It was not God coming down, but man going up." Even the raising of Lazarus may be "only a proof of the exceptional physical or vital force of the Master, shown in a less degree by his curing other [*sic!*] diseases. It was the highest example of the power of the soul over body—of spirit over matter—of vital forces over physical atoms" (p. 329). From all of which we may begin to see what Dr. Clarke's frank admission that Jesus "possessed some extraordinary power" means: "Rabbi Jeshua's" solution of the problem was that Jesus did nothing remarkable; "Philochristus's," that what he did was not very remarkable; "Thomas's" is, that it is human to do remarkable things. The one simply lowers miracles to human capacity; the other elevates human capacity to miracles; in their conception of the person of Jesus while in the world and his manifestation of himself, there is scarcely a choice between them.

Yet Dr. Clarke finds himself bound to engage in the work of lowering our conception of the miracles too. We have already seen examples of this, as for instance in his remarks on the raising of the dead. And indeed, the task of lifting humanity so high is a great one; if it is to succeed, at least miracles must not be either multiplied or magnified unduly. Dr. Clarke frankly admits that some miracles happened, as, for example, cures in general, and especially cases of demoniacs, the walking on the water, the raising of the dead—even of Lazarus. Even these are lowered, however, as much as possible by the assumption that the action of the miraculous power was *slow* (pp. 132, 136, 186, 277)—as if that made it any more explicable—sometimes by a hint that it was even *incomplete* (p. 277). Other miracles have doubt thrown on them—as, for example, the seven demons cast out of Mary Magdalene appear to have been only bad mental states, like "despair, the most deadly" of them all (p. 173). Others are frankly explained away. The money found in the fish's mouth is but a misunderstood trope; the descent of the dove at Jesus' baptism was but John's poetical words misinterpreted literally; the temptation was a parable; the falling down

of the mob in Gethsemane was owing to the pushing back of the front rank, etc. The miracle of the loaves and fishes furnishes perhaps the best example of Dr. Clarke's methods: "The prayer was so heavenly that all of my own hunger went away. . . . The people took the little morsels from his hands and tasted, and gave it quickly to their neighbors. I saw many who had concealed their food to keep it for their own use; and they also brought it forward to be blessed, and gave it speedily to each other" (p. 179). No wonder, if no one was hungry, and no one ate, and "many" brought out hidden food, there were twelve baskets full of fragments gathered up! The reader will observe, however, that Dr. Clarke, when his purpose serves, can suggest explanations of a class which neither "Philochristus" nor "Rabbi Jeshua" would care to countenance.

Of course, Jesus' foresight goes with his miracles. We are told sententially: "The Master's foresight was insight" (p. 309); but how "insight" which was not "foresight" could have told him just how many times Peter would deny him (p. 311), or that the distant Lazarus was dead (p. 319), Dr. Clarke has neglected to explain.

We do not purpose, however, in the case of Dr. Clarke, any more than in the cases of the other books we have had before us, to enter into any detailed refutation of the views put forth. Our purpose has been simply expository, and we judge that we have already said enough to exhibit the insufficiency of the narrative Dr. Clarke has put forth to stand as a "Life of Christ." One thing else has, perhaps, been made evident: Dr. Clarke's methods of work are similar to, perhaps not a whit sounder than, those of the authors of "Rabbi Jeshua" and "Philochristus." We, for one, cannot see why Dr. Clarke has not gone quite as far as they, except that his dogmatic or critical prepossessions did not demand it of him. He has gone just as far as his prejudices went, and the result is necessarily only another parody on the divine life of which the Gospels tell.

Are our readers ready to take these four "Gospels" in the place of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John? We must confess



that our study of them has not predisposed us in their favor. It is all too plain why they are what they are, and—omitting Mr. Hart's "Judas," which may stand as the representative of *orthodox* "apocrypha"—their parallelism with the heretical apocryphal Gospels of the early Church is startling. Even the methods of the chief heretics are reproduced in them: at one extreme, "Rabbi Jeshua," like Marcion, uses the shears; at the other, Dr. Clarke, like Valentinus, through desire "*uti integro instrumento*," seeks relief through strange exegesis. They stand together in this, however, that to one and all alike the motive of writing is hatred of the supernatural—it is miracle which is the common *σκάνδαλον*. The actual conception of the character and dramatisation of the acts of the non-miraculous Christ whom they invent is more difficult to account for. Lord Tennyson, in a recent letter, complains of certain critics who "impute themselves" to their victim. "There are many historians," writes Gibbon, "who put us in mind of the admirable saying of the great Condé to Cardinal de Retz: '*Ces coquins nous font parler et agir comme ils auroient fait eux-mêmes à notre place.*'" Can this be the explanation of these so painfully grating portraitures of Jesus? At all events, as historical studies, our apocrypha must be pronounced valueless and undeserving of serious refutation. In reading them, we have felt with unwonted vividness the truth of M. Renan's words—words which may be taken as having special reference to studies of this class and of this tendency—for is not he himself a notable writer of apocrypha?—"I was drawn towards the historical sciences—little conjectural sciences, which are pulled down as often as they are set up, and which will be neglected an hundred years hence."<sup>1</sup> "A hundred years hence!" Ah! the great historico-romanticist has given far too long a lease of life to such books as ours. No doubt, he would himself admit it, for was he not speaking of himself in these words? and was he not speaking of our authors in these: "*En réalité, pas de personnes ont le droit de ne pas croire au Christianisme*"? in which we fully agree with him. For the rest, we wish only in

---

<sup>1</sup> In "Souvenirs d'Enfance et de Jeunesse," 1883.

conclusion to remind our authors and all of like mind with them that *criticism of sources* is not to be confined to those who wrote two thousand years ago—that modern writers, too, may be ordered to stand and give account of their authorities—especially when they are found fashioning strange stories—(may we be allowed one word of Greek?)—

ὄθεν κέ τις οὐδέ ἰδοίτο.

BENJ. B. WARFIELD.

---

ARTICLE VII.

AN EXPOSITION OF ROMANS VI. 4.

Perhaps no portion of God's word has been less understood, and more perverted, than the one which the writer now proposes to expound. Some of the most dangerous errors of the Greek and Roman Catholic Churches in ancient times had their origin in a wrong interpretation of this Scripture; and beyond doubt, many of the injurious and false teachings of Baptists, Campbellites, and Mormons in modern days had the same origin. This text, misunderstood and perverted, has in all ages been the main resource of immersionists, from Tertullian and others in the second century down to J. R. Graves, Alexander Campbell, and Joe Smith the Mormon, in this nineteenth century. Therefore, before proceeding to a direct exposition of the text, we will first storm and capture this stronghold of the immersionists, and instead of spiking their big gun, will turn it heavily loaded against their vulnerable ranks. "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Now, please to observe here, that God's word in this text affirms that by baptism we are buried into *death*, while immersionists teach that we ought to be buried into *water*. The Lord teaches one thing, and immersionists teach another and very different thing. Death is one thing, water is quite another

VOL. XXXV., NO. 4—12.