

difficulty in explaining the origin of Paulinism will never disappear by being ignored; it will never yield to compromises of any kind. It will disappear only when Jesus is recognized as being really what Paul presupposes Him to be and what all the Gospels represent Him as being—the eternal Son of God, come to earth for the redemption of man, now seated once more on the throne of His glory, and working in the hearts of His disciples through His Spirit, as only God can work. Such a solution was never so unpopular as it is to-day. Acceptance of it will involve a Copernican revolution in many departments of human thought and life. But refusal of such acceptance has left an historical problem which so far has not been solved.” \*

Si cette solution est repoussée, ce n'est pas seulement l'exégèse et l'histoire qui s'embarrassent de difficultés insolubles; c'est la vie de tous les chrétiens, c'est la vie de l'Eglise qui se perd sans espoir. Il est trop vrai que cette solution est impopulaire en dehors des milieux catholiques, ce nous sera un nouveau motif de féliciter le Dr. Relton d'avoir si courageusement défendu cette thèse vitale, et de l'avoir fait avec tant de talent.

JULES LEBRETON.

## THE CRITICAL WORK OF JOHANNES WEISS†

### (I.)

It might have been expected that so considerable a scholar as Johannes Weiss would have left behind him some friend or pupil who would tell the story of his life and attempt some estimate of his character and work. But Weiss died in August, 1914, and in the terrible happenings of that fateful time his death passed almost unregarded. Enquiries made in Germany, with the kind help of Dr. Albert Schweitzer, elicited the reply that Frau Weiss herself knew of only one article which she felt to be a worthy tribute to her husband's memory, and that this was the work of an Englishman.‡ I can do little, therefore, to amplify or illustrate the outline of facts and dates which are already on record.

Johannes Weiss was born in 1863 at Kiel, where Bernhard Weiss, his father, was Professor of New Testament Exegesis. Born and bred in the atmosphere of Biblical scholarship, he owed much to his father's inspiration and teaching. His abiding sense of this debt is expressed in the Preface to *Das älteste*

\* *The Origin of Paul's Religion*. New York: Macmillan, 1921, p. 312.

† Part of two lectures delivered at Oxford in June, 1922, at the invitation of Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis, by H. N. Bate, M.A., Canon of Carlisle.

‡ F. C. Burkitt, "Johannes Weiss, In Memoriam," *Harvard Theological Review*, July, 1915.

*Evangelium* (1902), which was dedicated to the elder Weiss in commemoration of his jubilee as a Professor:

"A generation ago, in 1872, my father dedicated his book on St. Mark's Gospel to his father, in commemoration of his fiftieth year of office. I do the same to-day. It may indeed be open to question whether my father and teacher will find great pleasure in the book which I offer him. It is possible that he, and many others with him, will be more strongly impressed by the points at which I diverge from him than by the ground which we have in common. I can only say that in this sphere of study I have learnt from no one so much as from him, and that it is a pleasure to me to find myself more and more strongly convinced of the soundness of his judgment upon points of cardinal importance. That I accept, while he rejects, the hypothesis of an Ur-Marcus is of little significance in comparison with the great point in which we concur—namely, that we both hold the text of Mark to be at many points less original than that of Matthew or Luke, and hold also that Mark made use of Q, and even took portions of his narrative from it. But, above all, in the study of the literary and dogmatic character of the Gospel, as also in the attempt to go back to its sources, I believe myself to be continuing a thread which my father was the first to spin."

Weiss, whose life was not destined to be a long one, came early into the full possession of his powers. He was at Göttingen from 1884 to 1895, and obtained a professorship there in 1890, when he was no more than twenty-seven years old. Leaving Göttingen in 1895, he held a chair at Marburg for thirteen years; and the last seven years of his life were spent at Heidelberg, where he succeeded Adolf Deissmann in 1908.

While yet a student, Weiss had already begun to work at the problems with which his name was to be most closely connected, and had written an essay on the "Idea of the Kingdom of God in Theology." In 1892 he published the little book which brought the problem of eschatology into the forefront of critical enquiry—*Die Predigt Jesu von Reiche Gottes*. In its original form it was little more than a pamphlet, issued as a flaming challenge to Liberal Protestantism. It is now very hard to obtain a copy of that pamphlet. Weiss, I imagine, did not wish it to survive. The second edition, issued in 1900, is a very different book—not a challenge, but a work of considered judgments, restating the eschatological view in the light of criticism.

In the history of New Testament scholarship the name of Weiss will always be connected with that turn of the tide which began in 1892. Professor Burkitt's memorial study is entirely

devoted to the two editions of *Die Predigt Jesu*. But it would be an injustice to a many-sided scholar if it were forgotten that Weiss achieved high excellence in many parts of the field of New Testament study. I propose, therefore, to call attention here to some aspects of his work which have not, as yet, attracted all the attention which they deserve.

Four of his books, apart from the *Predigt Jesu*, have already some measure of standing in England, and some hope of survival: the analytic study of St. Mark (*Das älteste Evangelium*), to which I shall return later; the commentaries on St. Luke and 1 Corinthians, in the latest edition of Meyer-Weiss' Commentary; and the great posthumous and unfinished work *Das Urchristenthum*, the second volume of which was completed by Dr. Rudolf Knopf, of Bonn, and published in 1917. But from a long list of minor works I should wish to single out two for special mention. In 1897 Weiss published a study of the purpose and literary character of the Acts of the Apostles. Both Professor Burkitt and M. Maurice Goguel concur in regarding this brief essay as marking the end and the beginning of a period in the history of criticism. "It appeared," says Professor Burkitt, "at a time when the reconstruction and reconsideration of lost sources seemed almost the only occupation of the up-to-date New Testament investigator." "Johannes Weiss' work," says M. Goguel, "may be considered as having closed the period in which the search for lost sources was the sole preoccupation of the student: but its merit is far from being merely negative. In so far as he directed the attention of exegetical enquiry to the discovery of the author's intentions, he may be said to have moved backwards in the direction of Tübingen. But side by side with this the programme outlined by Johannes Weiss has an element of real novelty: it is that he invites attention to the literary characteristics of the book. Thus a new phase in the criticism of Acts is opened, in which the literary character and the historical value of the narrative are scrutinized together. The point of view from which the book is regarded grows wider, and ceases to be narrowly theological: and together with this expansion of the problem there comes the corresponding gain that men who are not exegetes by profession, but classical and historical scholars, such as Schwartz, Wellhausen, Wendland, and Norden, make important contributions to the study of Acts."

The ground thus covered by Weiss is worked over again in the first volume of *Das Urchristenthum*. But another study which also appeared in 1897, *Beiträge zur paulinischen Rhetorik*, represents the results of work which, so far as I know, Weiss did not carry beyond the point then reached; and it calls for special

notice both because it deals with a type of enquiry for which Weiss was peculiarly well qualified, and because its method and results are clearly capable of fruitful extension in competent hands.

Weiss was, as I should infer, a man of fine and delicate artistic perception: a good judge of values alike in form and in matter. As an exegete he was, if anything, over-scrupulous, over-sensitive in perceiving shades of feeling and intention in the text before him: he could be trusted to keep himself always in touch with the most delicate variations in his author's mood. And to a keen sense of colour he added a robust sense of form, which was reflected alike in his own admirable prose style and in his work as a critic of the written word. Hence such studies as those of Wendland on Early Christian literary forms and Norden's *Antike Kunstprosa* were peculiarly congenial to his mind.

In a lecture given to a clerical society at Karlsruhe in 1908 (*Die Aufgaben der ntl. Wissenschaft in der Gegenwart*, pp. 16 f.)—a lecture in which a convenient summary of Weiss' own contribution to the study of literary structure may be found—he laments the distaste with which the study of form in the New Testament is commonly regarded. “The very word ‘rhetoric’ is repulsive to every right-minded man who firmly believes that *pectus facit theologium*. It suggests to him at once an empty jingle of words, and he rejoices in the conviction that it is content, rather than form, that really matters.” And yet “we can never form a complete estimate of a great historical movement like Christianity if we enquire only into its leading ideas; we must also see and feel why the particular form of utterance in which the new force expresses itself was able to work with such creative power.”

The *Beiträge zur paulinischen Rhetorik* exemplify the application of these principles to the Pauline Epistles. In an essay on the Pauline conception of freedom Weiss threw fresh light on the relation between the substance of St. Paul's ethical teaching and that of the Stoic preachers: here he is concerned with questions of form, and sets himself to show that in respect of his technical equipment as a writer St. Paul was a student, or rather an accomplished master, of Stoic modes of expression.

Weiss' essay includes an exhaustive analytic study of the Epistle to the Romans, and with this it ends: leaving thus an unfinished task which it would be well if a well-trained hand could continue. In particular it would be desirable, if the literary methods discernible in such Epistles as Romans and Corinthians exhibit features susceptible of some degree of scientific classification, that the criteria which such analysis supplies should be applied, let us say, to the Colossian letter

first, then to the Ephesians, and after this to the Pastoral Epistles. I do not suggest that in the case of a mind and a pen so versatile as that of St. Paul the mere analysis of stylistic method is capable of yielding definite dogmatic results: it is certain that negative results based upon such data would be more than precarious. But I do suggest that in the case of the Ephesian letter, for instance, a case in which critics are peculiarly apt to allow an undue weight to subjective considerations, a really close analysis of style, following on a similar scrutiny as applied to Colossians, might yield valuable results of a less subjective kind. It would be, to say the least, interesting if the application of tests which Johannes Weiss has added to the critic's outfit should be found to lead in a direction unfavourable to that rather over-definite rejection of Ephesians to which Weiss was himself inclined. In any case, the experiment is worth making.

I turn now to the consideration of Weiss' critical work on the Gospels. And here I must begin by admitting the incompleteness of my studies. I have not had the opportunity of working through the commentary on St. Luke, in the last edition of Meyer-Weiss' Commentary, nor have I read, as I should have wished to do, *Die Nachfolge Christi und die Predigt der Gegenwart* (1895), which would have enabled me to form a clearer view of Weiss' judgment upon the ethical results of thorough-going eschatology. Further, I have only been able to give a passing glance to the translation and exposition of the Synoptists in *Die Schriften des neuen Testaments neu übersetzt*, etc. That presentation of the New Testament text in German speech, together with an interpretation designed for well-educated readers and embodying the results of German criticism, was Weiss' chief popular contribution to New Testament study. An Englishman, contemplating these four well-packed volumes, of which many thousands of copies have been sold, may well wonder whether it would not be possible to make the best results of English scholarship accessible to our own people on similar lines. Here is a complete exposition of the New Testament, now in its third edition, revised after Weiss' death by Bousset and Heitmüller; it has sold, and is still selling. Shall we look to the very limited number of our competent scholars, or to the timidity of the English publisher, to explain the fact that nothing of the sort has been attempted in our own country?

Apart, then, from an equally popular and entirely conclusive demolition of those perversions of sound history which are linked with the names of Kalthoff, Drews, Jensen, J. M. Robertson, and, we must regretfully add, Sir J. G. Frazer, and one or two other "exoteric" essays, my reading has been confined to *Das älteste Evangelium* and *Die Predigt Jesu von Reiche Gottes*.



The first impression which these works have left upon my mind is that they came from the pen of a man who, with all the true scholar's modesty and critical self-restraint, had a thorough belief in his work, a great happiness in doing it, and a strong faith in the possibility of real progress in New Testament study. One may attribute to him two qualities which he regarded as essential to the student—he was a *wahrheitsliebender* and an *arbeitsfroher Mann*. In respect of the life of our Lord, he had no tincture of scepticism. “There is no ground,” he wrote, “for resigning ourselves to the belief that we shall never know. . . . The material which lies before us is inexhaustible in its variety, wonderful in its beauty and wealth; we have only to compare it with the poverty of that which scholars allow themselves to use as a basis for the life of Buddha in order to feel how rich we are.”

The type of study from which Weiss expected the best results, and upon which he spent the greatest part of his own labour, was that of regressive analysis. He regarded the history of the New Testament, its text and substance, like that of the Church which created it, as dividing itself naturally into certain well-marked stages, from any one of which it was possible to work backwards. Thus, in respect of the New Testament text, on which, perhaps, he would not have claimed to have more than a general right to speak, he taught that the most crucial moment or stage in the history of Gospels and Epistles alike was that at which the separate documents were brought together as *Εὐαγγέλιον* and *Ἀπόστολος*. It ought to be possible, he held, to recover first of all a text which would represent something very like that of the earliest *corpus* of Gospels and of Epistles. But if such a text were constituted, it would have to be taken, not as the ultimate goal of textual study, but as the starting-point for further analysis. The *corpus Paulinum* would be found to show the marks of the ecclesiastical editor's hand. It would not give us the letters as they were read to the Christians of Corinth or Philippi. But it might be possible to get back a little further towards the originals. In particular, we might discover how far the text of the Epistles has been modified by the process of harmonization, and by other modes of adaptation for general use in the Churches. Possible instances of such a process are not uncommon,—e.g., in 2 Cor. xiii. 10, we read *Διὰ τοῦτο ταῦτα ἀπὸν γράφω ἵνα παρὼν μὴ ἀποτόμως χρῆσωμαι κατὰ τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἣν ὁ κύριος ἔδωκέν μοι εἰς οἰκοδομὴν καὶ οὐκ εἰς καθαίρεσιν*, a sentence in which no word is superfluous or out of place. But in 2 Cor. x. 8, *ἐάν τε γὰρ περισσότερον καυχῆσωμαι περὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας ἡμῶν ἢς ἔδωκεν ὁ κύριος εἰς οἰκοδομὴν καὶ οὐκ εἰς*

*καθαίρειν ὑμῶν, οὐκ αἰσχυνθήσομαι*, the words common to this place and xiii. 8, have a certain awkwardness, and it is conceivable that they had no place in the original text. In Rom. i. 16, again, *Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι*, the word *πρῶτον* is, to say the least, unessential: and the conjecture that it has crept in from ii. 9, 10 would in any case be plausible. The omission of the word by B.G. Tert. may be taken to make it certain. Or, to take an example of another type, an example in which ecclesiastical modification is suggested, the address of 1 Corinthians, which in the existing text is extended far beyond the limits of Corinth to "all who call upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ in every place," does not look, on the surface at least, as if it were original. Weiss held, therefore, that in the reconstruction of the Pauline text there is room for a type of criticism which will remove from the Epistles, by means of scrupulously disciplined conjecture, such traces of redaction as these.

In the case of the Gospels, the task lying before textual critics, as Weiss conceived it, is more difficult in some ways, easier in others. It is more easy, at least in so far as it involves the detecting of harmonization and the like, because in the Gospels two or more relatively similar forms of practically the same text have to be compared, in order to decide which is the more original, and which of the Gospels has been corrupted by harmonization with the other: whereas in the Epistles the problems presented are far less definite and the room for conjecture is all too ample. It is more difficult because the textual history of the Gospels is in itself far more complex than that of the Epistles. Yet the problem of both groups of books was for Weiss fundamentally the same: that is, to determine, even approximately, the earliest form of what we may call the ecclesiastical text—*i.e.*, in the case of the Gospels, the text of the earliest Euangelion Tetramorphon—and then to work back from this towards the rediscovery of those countless points of individuality in each Gospel which either unconscious memory, that great harmonizer, or deliberate purpose has blurred or obliterated. And in this process, great as were the results which Weiss, like the rest of the world, expected from the study of Western authorities—I note especially his reliance on the work of Merx upon the Syriac texts—he clearly looked forward towards, and even anticipated, a stage in the story of textual discovery at which the study of authors might become more important than the study of readings—*i.e.*, at which the sum-total of purely textual evidence might have been recorded and appraised—and readings might come to be regarded as original on the strength of purely internal considerations, supported, by a

weight of MS. authority which thirty years ago would have been regarded as negligible, or perhaps by no MS. authority at all.

The importance of harmonization as a factor in the formation of textual types in the Gospels is, of course, no new theme; but it has received fresh interest from its treatment in the inaugural lecture of Professor C. H. Turner, who, not unlike Weiss in this respect, is prepared to maintain the relative originality of certain readings attested by the old Latin *e* or *k* against the whole mass of other evidence, and also to claim a legitimate place even for conjectural emendation of New Testament texts. But there is one point in Weiss' handling of this factor which deserves particular attention, opening out the way, as it does, to further investigation. It is this—that he asks for a more careful study of the influence of the Fourth Gospel upon the Synoptic text. He points to Matt. xxvii. 49, ἄλλος δὲ λαγῶν λόγχην ἔνυξεν αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευραν, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα, as an obvious instance. Here the whole weight of Western evidence, together with Origen, goes against the “Johannine” insertion. Other instances cited by Weiss appear to call for very careful enquiry. It was in the nature of things, he urges, that as soon as the fourth Gospel came to stand together with the others it should exercise a dominant influence upon the formation of the Gospel text in general. He discerns traces of such influence both in cases where it is directly suggested by the evidence of our *apparatus criticus* and also in certain others. (a) He discerns it in at least two places in Luke xxiv.: in xxiv. 12, “Peter rose up and ran to the tomb, and stooping down seeth the linen cloths lying apart, and departed to his own home wondering at that which had come to pass,” and in xxiv. 37, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς εἰρήνη ὑμῖν; and (b) in many passages where Mark stands apparently alone: in the healing of the deaf and dumb man and of the blind man, in the one loaf which the disciples had with them on the lake, in the astonishment of Pilate that Jesus was already dead, in Peter's warming himself at the fire. In these alleged cases from St. Mark it must be remembered that Weiss was a strong believer in the theory of an Ur-Markus: and it is not entirely clear whether he means to suggest that these notable peculiarities of Mark were what we may call tertiary or secondary—i.e., whether they originated in the second century, after the Gospel had reached its almost final stage, and are to be treated as textual variants on a rather abnormally large scale, or whether they are to be credited to the nebulous redactor who, in Weiss' view, revised the Ur-Markus after it had been used by Matthew and Luke. I imagine that he would treat them rather as redactional than as scribal additions: and such a view would suggest both



a very late date for Weiss' redactor and a rather early date for the currency and influence of the fourth Gospel.

I need not follow this further. But the general suggestion of Johannine influence upon the text of Mark, and also, in the cases mentioned, of Luke, opens up a problem which has, and had for Weiss, a peculiar interest. I shall have to return later to Weiss' handling of certain Johannine questions. At this point I only wish to suggest that in the case of Luke, at least, it is wise to be very chary of admitting isolated and sporadic contamination from John: and that because such admissions may prejudice and hamper our consideration of a delicate and, as yet, unsettled question—the question, namely, of the general relation of the Lukan to the Johannine tradition. That relation might prove, and would, I think, on close investigation, prove to be a rather close one: or, I might say, if we could confront Canon Streeter's Proto-Luke with an Ur-Johannes, it would be found that they were fairly near of kin; and the logical order of procedure required by the facts would place first a general investigation of the relationship which I have alleged, and after this the consideration of particular passages such as those which may or may not form part of the original Lukan text of chapter xxiv.

H. N. BATE.

*(To be concluded.)*

## THE RUSSIAN CHURCH UNDER THE BOLSHEVIKS

SACRED TO THE MEMORY OF MY MARTYRED BROTHER ALEXANDER,  
SHOT BY THE BOLSHEVIKS IN THE TOWN OF URALSK ON THE NIGHT OF  
JUNE 25/12 TO 26/13, 1919, AND WHOSE BODY WAS THROWN INTO THE  
URAL RIVER AND NEVER RECOVERED.

Unto him be eternal memory.

“And the light shineth in darkness.”—*St. John* i. 5.

INFINITELY calamitous is the fate of Russia. It appears a moral disaster to all who are not yet completely overpowered by purely egoistical pursuits and have still retained a certain amount of human sensitiveness. If the shock of a sudden great joy may sometimes occasion death, no imagination can stand the horrors of socialistic fury let loose. Many are acquainted with and realize this fact, but we must warn them that this overwhelming external aspect is infinitely below the terrible reality. Only a personal experience of this *inferno* may give an adequate idea of its actual frightfulness. Material losses, in spite of their “astronomic” proportions, may, nevertheless, be recovered. In that respect Russia is still the “country of