

Space forbids me to speak at length of Dr Gwynn's exhaustive Introduction. One of the very best things in it is his searching criticism of Professor Zimmer's Theory ('Keltische Kirche') on pp. xcvi-c. Dr Gwynn has no difficulty in shewing that the real Patrick cannot be spirited away by such hypotheses, however ingenious. The care and labour expended by Dr Gwynn on the elucidation of the Irish documents have left nothing for any successor to say.

The Introduction to the Latin Biblical Text is not so exhaustive. But in this department of study we are only at the beginning of great discoveries. The Irish Latin text of the New Testament preserves to-day (so I believe) the earliest base that we know, and its reconstruction is now for the first time being made possible by the exact publication of such MSS as the Book of Armagh.

Truth and my own experience compel me to say that the editions of the Irish MSS  $r$  and  $r_2$  do *not* meet to-day the requirements of modern scholarship.

Dr Gwynn has done much for Sacred Study. As a Syriac student, he has edited an edition of the Apocalypse that alone would be a remarkable achievement for one man. But his last work is even more important, and it will live, not only as a faithful and altogether admirable reproduction of one of the earliest monuments of Irish art, but also as the reproduction *paginatim lineatim verbatim* of one of the most precious MSS of the Sacred Scriptures that the world contains.

E. S. BUCHANAN

### 'NAZARENE'

*Nazareth and the Beginnings of Christianity: a view based upon philological evidence.* By CHAMPLIN BURRAGE, B. Litt. (Oxford University Press, 1914.)

IN this essay Mr Burrage attempts two things: (1) to find a link between the conceptions of Jesus as a Nazarene, or inhabitant of Nazareth, and as a Nazirite, or Jewish ascetic; (2) to explain how a certain body of early Jewish Christians came by the name 'Nazarenes', applied to them by ecclesiastical writers, and to bring out the true implication of this name. As regards (1), he claims to have made—'during the prosecution of quite other philological investigations'—the accidental discovery of 'the source of the prophecy that the Messiah "should be called a Nazarene"—the very passage [he says] which in my opinion the writer of the Gospel according to the Hebrews must have had before him when he originally wrote the words now embodied in our canonical Matthew' (Preface).

Before going further it may be as well to mention that Mr Burrage identifies the Gospel according to the Hebrews with 'that long-sought document, the Logia, or Q, of which the critics have written so much in recent years' (p. 14). This was the first, 'the *oldest* Gospel'. When Gentiles began to be converted, they required a Greek translation for use in their churches. 'This fact resulted in the preparation of our canonical Gospel of Matthew, wherein some features of the Aramaic Gospel were omitted as not appearing quite credible or acceptable to the Western mind' (p. 21). 'The Gospel as a whole was evidently so like our present Gospel according to Matthew, that only some of its more outstanding characteristics are mentioned by Jerome' (p. 17). Our first Gospel 'must have been practically a reproduction of the Gospel according to the Hebrews' (*ibid*). We have already seen that Matt 11 23 is traced to the original Hebrew Gospel. Mr Burrage does not say whether that Gospel contained the rest of the narrative of the Infancy. The Ebionite Gospel is distinct from that according to the Hebrews, and not merely a mutilated form of it, as Epiphanius supposed (p. 15). 'we cannot do better than to designate the Ebionite Gospel, the original Mark' (*ibid*). 'The Ebionite Gospel, the original Gospel of Mark, likewise [like the Gospel according to the Hebrews] was prepared in Palestine, and was later translated and modified into approximately its canonical form' (p. 21). I now pass on to the main theses of his essay.

Mr Burrage thinks that we can find in the New Testament both the ideas mentioned above under (1)—viz the conceptions of Jesus as a Nazarene and a Nazirite—and that they are contained in the terms *Ναζαρηνός* and *Ναζωπαίος*. The former term means an inhabitant of Nazareth, while the latter has two significations: (a) inhabitant of Nazareth, (b) Messiah. The meaning Messiah for *Ναζωπαίος* is dependent on Isa. xi 1. This passage is one of the great Messianic prophecies, and was understood as such by the Jews. The Targum paraphrases it thus: 'And there shall go forth a king [=Messiah] from the sons of Jesse, and a *Messiah* from his sons' sons' (p. 25). The Hebrew word interpreted '*Messiah*' in the Targum is, of course, *meser*. Thus '*Neşer*' became a Jewish title of the Messiah. But in the unpointed Hebrew text it came to be read '*Noşer*', and from this 'was derived the Greek word *Ναζωπαίος*'.

But we have not yet got to the conception of Jesus as a Nazirite (an ascetic) which Mr Burrage finds in the New Testament, nor is Isa. xi 1. Mr Burrage's accidentally discovered source of the prophecy referred to in Matt 11 23: it does not explain the spelling *Ναζωπαίος*. Here Mr Burrage is faced by the obstacle which all writers on 'Nazareth' and 'Nazarene' must attempt to get over—the Greek letter ζ in the

words *Naζapéθ*, or *Naζapá*, *Naζapηνός*, and *Naζωπαίος*. For the place in Galilee where Jesus dwelt 'that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a *Naζωπαίος*' (Matt 11 23), could only be identified in the second century with a town, or village, called Nasareth (Syr Nāsrath) any place, distinct from this, called Nazareth is unknown. And yet we cannot assume that Nazareth is merely the Greek way of spelling Našareth, because, as Prof. Burkitt has shewn, Greek does not put ζ for Semetic š. Neither, for the same reason, could *Naζωπαίος* come from Naser or Nošer.

Mr Burrage's explanation of the spelling *Naζωπαίος* is found in Appendix viii, on 'The source of the prophecy that Jesus should be called a Nazarene', and it is here that he offers his solution of Matt 11 23—a solution which other scholars 'have as nearly discovered as possible without doing so'. The cause of their failure was that 'the solution was too simple and was to be found in such an unexpected place' (p 41). I confess to some little disappointment here on turning over the page and finding the Old Testament passage to be Judges viii 2-24—the annunciation and birth of Samson. Personally, I had always thought this a natural passage to which to refer in connexion with the supposition that *Naζωπαίος* in Matt 11 23 may mean Nazirite (see *JTS* April 1913, p 476). Mr Burrage prints these verses of Judges in full, with extracts from Matt 11 and Luke 1, 11 in parallel columns. But while the parallels from Luke (mainly in reference to St John the Baptist) are noteworthy, those from Matthew seem hardly to deserve consideration. Yet apart from the evidence of this synoptic table no further reason is adduced for believing that St Matthew thought of Jesus as a Nazirite. Mr Burrage's conclusion from the evidence supplied by the table is stated as follows. 'The view here adduced offers very little difficulty. The word *Naζωπαίος* by which נזיר is translated in Matthew presupposes the use of the Hebrew unpointed text in which *yod* was naturally mistaken by the translator for *vaw*. The word accordingly, in this instance, is certainly a translation of נזיר, and really stands for Nazirite, whereas the sense of the passage requires it to be read Nasarene (Nazarene), the secondary meaning of *Naσωπαίος*' (p 46).

But in view of the fact that this substitution of Nazirite for Nasarene (= 'inhabitant of Nazareth', which 'the sense of the passage requires') is traced to the actual Hebrew author of the 'Gospel according to the Hebrews', and of the further fact that, as Mr Burrage seems to have shewn, Isa 53 1 was already understood by Jews in a Messianic sense (so that Naser would mean Messiah) may we not reasonably ask, Is it possible that a Hebrew writer, with such a prophecy as Isa 53 1 in the background, could have said that Jesus went and dwelt in Nasareth that the prophecy might be fulfilled, 'He shall be called a Nazirite' (a Jewish

ascetic)? The constant Syriac interpretation of Matt 11 23 (found e.g. in Ephraim on the Diatessaron Moes p. 36), which finds the prophecy in Isa. 41 1, may serve to shew how unlikely it is that a Semitic writer would have connected Naṣareth with Nazirite. St Jerome, too, finds it necessary to go to the Hebrew of Isa. 41 1 for the prophecy (see *ad Pammachium* Migne *P. L.* xii col. 574—a more striking passage than either his comment on Isa. 41 1 or that on Matt 11 23 quoted by Mr Burrage). Again in the letter of Paula and Eustochium to Marcella (*P. L.* xii col. 491), inviting her to come to Palestine, we find the statement that Nazareth means 'flower'. This rests on the spelling Naṣareth, and shews that in one of the circles in which Jerome moved the name was connected with the *neser* of Isa. 41 1—'et flos (= *neser*) de radice eius ascendet'. Mr Burrage's explanation, then, of Ναζωπαῖος as a 'prophetic form' (p. 7) of Ναωπαῖος would seem to labour under the old difficulties.

As regards the place Nazareth, Mr Burrage takes the view that it was not a town but 'a district of larger Galilee beyond Jordan and the Sea of Galilee' (p. 19). So far as I can gather from his essay (for he does not make himself quite clear on this point), his view is that the name Nazareth came into existence only a little before the year A.D. 70. He insists that the early Jewish Christians, who fled to the East of the Jordan before the capture of Jerusalem, were called Ναωπαῖοι in the sense of 'Christians', followers of the Messiah (Himself, as already explained, the *Neser* of Isa. 41 1), and he seems to say (p. 9) that the country they then occupied received its name from them.<sup>1</sup> It would follow from this that the term Ναζαρηνός (an inhabitant of Nazareth), and Ναζωπαῖος in the same sense, is everywhere in the New Testament an anachronism, and that our Lord could not during His earthly life have been called a Nazarene at all, for the simple reason that there was as yet no place called Nazareth. But here it is possible that I have not rightly apprehended Mr Burrage's meaning. If the place to which those Ναωπαῖοι retreated just before A.D. 70 was already called Nazareth (Ναζαρέθ, or Ναζαρά), then we merely have a very odd coincidence.

These early Christians (Ναωπαῖοι) are further identified with the Nazarenes, or Nazoraeans, mentioned by Epiphanius and others as Christian heretics who used a Hebrew Gospel. Epiphanius, according to Mr Burrage, thought of these people as heretics on no other ground than this, that he did not understand their name, thinking it meant Nazirites, or ascetics, whereas it merely described them as Christians (p. 35). That the name Nazarenes properly described the people who bore it as Christians, seems quite possible—but only, I am inclined to imagine, in the sense that they were followers of Jesus of Nazareth, not as 'the inhabitants of Naṣara' (p. 9).

<sup>1</sup> 'In other words, the territory named Ναζαρά means the Christian country.'

I cannot but think that Mr Burrage's very interesting and suggestive essay would have gained enormously by the addition of a short summary, setting out concisely the results arrived at. In a study which involves the treatment of so many terms so apt to be confused with each other there is a danger of the wood becoming obscured by the trees, and the reader cannot be given too much help in such cases.

R H CONNOLLY

### EUCKEN'S PHILOSOPHY.

*An Interpretation of Rudolf Eucken's Philosophy* By W TUDOR JONES, Ph D (Jena) (Williams & Norgate, 1912)

A TRANSLATION of Professor Eucken's *Der Wahrheitsgehalt der Religion* by Dr Tudor Jones was reviewed in a previous number of this JOURNAL. In the work now before us Dr Tudor Jones undertakes to give an account of the personality and an 'interpretation' of the philosophy—especially in its bearing on the problems of religion—of the eminent Jena professor who has (it is plain) been his master not only in philosophy, as the word is now generally understood, but in the spiritual life generally. Prof Eucken is a thinker who presents to those who wish to grasp his precise point of view some peculiar difficulties, arising from a certain air of vagueness which characterizes his exposition, and the style of Dr Tudor Jones, as those acquainted with his translation will know, is not well adapted to assist in helping his readers to overcome these difficulties. Yet English students of Eucken will find this little book of real assistance towards the understanding of Eucken's position. The special feature of it is shewn to be the recognition of the spiritual life as a reality, the existence and supreme value of which may be known directly and requires no external authentication, combined with a resolute refusal to rest satisfied with regarding it as something without transcendent or ontological significance, a refusal which sets Eucken as far from a purely subjective or pragmatic view of religion as the stress which he lays on the will sets him from any mere 'intellectualism'. A remarkable book, distinguished by singular independence and originality of thought, which has appeared within the last few months, Mr C J Shebbeare's *Religion in an Age of Doubt*—though it gives no indication of being influenced in any way by Eucken—has presented, in a form which will be more readily followed by English readers, a view in some ways strikingly similar to that which I have just attributed to Eucken. The study of this work, which in itself will repay any one who undertakes it will probably be found to have elucidated very considerably some of what is apt to seem most obscure in Eucken's treatment of the subject of religion. Such at least has been my own experience.

C C J WEBB