

BACON'S "CHRISTIANITY OLD AND NEW."¹

BY WILLIAM BENJAMIN SMITH.

PROFESSOR BACON'S recent book, "Christianity Old and New," is *advertised* as a "sufficient answer" to recent criticism. Such representation Professor Bacon could not himself authorize, for the book attempts no answer nor even reply at any point. It consists of three lectures given at Berkeley, Cal., on the E. T. Earl foundation, only slightly changed in wording and occasionally expanded, but supplemented by a new chapter on "Characterization of Jesus," much the most significant fourth of the book.

Chapter I treats of "The Evolution of Religion and Historic Types of Christianity" and consists of philosophic observations upon the vibration of religion between the two poles of egoism and altruism, the antitheses of personal salvation and social reformation, as shown in the alternate sway of national religion and nature-religion. Christianity is regarded Hegel-wise as the synthesis of the two, deriving from the Jew its national social ethical features, from the Greek its nature-mythical individualistic or personal mystical character,—in all which there is much just thought and vivid expression, and one may heartily thank the lecturer for these 42 pages. At one point a modification might enter: "The singling out of Christianity for persecution among the many oriental religions of personal redemption" is taken "as proof that the threat which it offered to the social ideal of the empire was not merely negative like theirs, but positive and aggressive." But it should be added that this aggression, so justly recognized, was distinctly, and one may say exclusively, directed against polytheism

¹ Under the title "Latest Lights and Shadows on the Jesus Question" in *The Monist* of October, Dr. Smith reviews a number of recent authors who have dealt critically with this subject during the current year: Harnack, Corssen, Burkitt, Barnes. The present review of Prof. Benjamin W. Bacon's work follows the same line of criticism.—ED.

and its immediate following. It is a cardinal conception of *Ecce Deus* that Protochristianity was just such a militant monotheism, at first more or less esoteric, afterwards exoteric. The lecture closes with the contrast of "President Eliot and Doctor Anderson" as representing "typically extreme views."

The second lecture takes up the "Nineteenth Century Liberalism" of the illustrious Harvard president and strives hard to treat it with "respect." Certainly the very highest "kind of respect" is due to the Doctor, if not the doctrine. This latter was quite the rage in Europe in the nineteenth century; being now somewhat *passée*, its voice a bit broken, it is thought about fit for the American stage in the twentieth century. One is reminded of a disturbance on a fixed star, the news of which reaches us in the next generation. Professor Bacon begins very generously, with extravagant concessions: "It is true that recent research has done much to dispel the nimbus from the central figure of the Gospels. Criticism has largely restored the portrait of the historic Jesus," with several other statements to the same effect, none of which he attempts to ground, none of which indeed can be grounded. The parallel to the "historical Jesus" with "Socrates, or Mohammed, or Julius Cæsar," is a parallelism of perpendiculars. On this point we need not dwell, for the assertions of the book are entirely unsupported, and what is more significant, they are practically withdrawn or transfigured in the concluding chapter.

One thing, however, must be noted: "The historical outline of Jesus's teaching, character, and career, down to the crucifixion is as little affected by the few anecdotes of miracle connected with the reports, as that of other ancient characters by the similar anecdotes related of them." It is but fair to say that this statement was made in 1911, and it is doubtful whether it expresses the author's attitude to-day. In any case, it is the polar opposite of correctness. Conybeare has strained every nerve to give it plausibility, both in his *Historical Christ* and in his translation of Philostratus, but it is false on its face and even preposterous. In an early review of Conybeare's book I shall show how utterly impossible is any comparison between Jesus and Apollonius. Bacon, referring to Gordon's *Religion and Miracle*, appeals to the apostles, especially to Paul, as alluding in "letters indubitably authentic to miraculous healings wrought 'by the power of the Spirit' through himself and others." Here there is much to remark. "Indubitably" means beyond doubt; what are the "letters" thus beyond doubt "authentic"? That all the letters are only very dubitably

genuine is proved by the fact that the genuineness of all has actually been doubted and denied by many critics of the highest eminence, to mention only Bauer, Loman, Pierson, Naber, Steck, Van Manen; and if the genuineness, much more the authenticity has been doubted. For my own part, though claiming no voice among critics, I am free to say and to defend the saying, that it is quite impossible to maintain the genuineness and at the same time the integrity of any of the great Pauline scriptures; if there be in them genuine Pauline material, it has certainly been "overworked" into a form remote enough from the original.

But even as they stand, do these letters make any such claims as are made for them? They do not. Perhaps the strongest statement is in the appendix to Romans (xv. 18f): "For I will not dare to speak of any things save those which Christ wrought through me, unto obedience of Gentiles, by word and deed, in power of signs and wonders, in power of Spirit of God, so that from Jerusalem and round about even unto Illyricum I have fulfilled the Gospel of Christ." The passage is un-Pauline, the text uncertain, but in any case it is only a rhetorical boast of the triumphs of the mission to the heathen; nothing is said about "miraculous healings." The author of 1 Cor. xiv. 18 boasts of speaking "with tongues more than ye all"; but no Gospel miracle is hinted. "Gifts of healing" are mentioned among other "gifts of the Spirit" (1 Cor. xii. 9, 28, 30), but there is no evidence or indication of miracle. In fact, the Epistles are notably devoid of miraculous pretensions.

But Bacon appeals to Acts, particularly the "We-sections," for "healings, exorcisms, visions, supernatural deliverances, and even a supposed resuscitation from death. In all of these both Paul and the diarist were personally participant." The reader will note the plurals. Let us examine closely. The first "We-section" extends from xvi. 10 to xvi. 17; there is no evidence of the "diary" after verse 17, nor is there anything miraculous in verses 10-17. The next appearance of the *We* is at xx. 5 and it disappears at verse 16. Herein is found the account of the fall of Eutychus. The account has clearly been "overworked," as appears in careful reading and on comparing verse 9 with verses 11 and 12. How it read in the diary we can not say, but even as it stands it does not record any miracle.

Next the *We* appears at xxi. 1 and continues to verse 18. This section contains the symbolic warning of Agabus, but nothing marvelous. The next apparition of *We* is at xxvii. 1. With some interruptions indicating thorough redaction, this section, descrip-

tive of Paul's famous sea-trip, extends to xxviii. 16. At xxvii. 21-26 it contains an account of Paul's dream; there is nothing to prove this was in the original diary, but even if it were, there is nothing miraculous in the story. At xxviii. 3-6 we find the account of the viper. Again there is nothing to show that this was in the original diary, but even if it were the story is not yet of a miracle. The same may be said of the recovery of the father of Publius (verses 8, 9). To me the signs of redaction are manifest; but even though we supposed "healed him" and "were healed" to belong to the original account—which seems very unlikely, for the interrupted We-account is clearly resumed at verse 10, "which also for many days honored us"—still it does not appear that there were "miraculous healings." Such is the whole story of the "contemporaneous diary"; it cannot be shown that it contained any story of a miracle, though like all travelers' tales it may have held here and there some loose and exaggerated statements.

With respect to the book of Acts in general, it is noteworthy that when all possible extension is given to the notion of the supernatural, there appear about 46 instances in its chapters. These are mostly in the earlier chapters, some 32 in the first half, only 14 in the second half, where the historical character is far more in evidence (Moffatt). But the great majority of these are trivial occurrences, hardly worth noting at all.

We find at i. 9 the ascension (1); ii. 3ff., the Pentecostal miracle of tongues (2); ii. 43, mere vagueness, "many wonders and signs were done by the apostles (in Jerusalem; and great fear was upon all)" where the well attested but now rejected parenthesis reveals the redactor, to whom we owe perhaps the whole verse (3); iii. 2ff., the lame healed (4); iv. 31, the house shaken (5); v. 5, 10, Ananias and Sapphira (6, 7); v. 12, repetition of ii. 43 (8); v. 16, many healings (9); v. 19, prison doors opened (10); vi. 8, Stephen's works (11); vi. 15, his face illuminated (12); vii. 55, his vision of Jesus (13); viii. 6, 7, Philip's deeds (14); viii. 26, the angel's visit to Philip (15); viii. 39, Philip rapt (16); ix. 4, Saul's Damascus vision (17); ix. 10ff., Ananias's vision (18); ix. 18, Saul's recovery (19); ix. 34, Æneas cured (20); ix. 40, Dorcas raised (21); x. 3ff., Cornelius's vision (22); x. 11, Peter's vision (23); x. 46, tongues and the Spirit (24); xi. 28, prophecy of drought (25); xii. 7, 10, Peter delivered (26, 27); xii. 23, Herod smitten by angel (28); xiii. 2, Barnabas and Saul chosen by Spirit (29); xiii. 11, Elymas blinded (30); xiv. 10, cripple cured at Lystra (31); xv. 12, signs and wonders (32); xvi. 6, Holy Spirit forbidding

(33); xvi. 9, Paul's dream (34); xvi. 18, exorcism (35); xvi. 26f., earthquake at Philippi (36); xviii. 9, vision at night (37); xix. 6, tongues and Spirit (38); xix. 12, cures by touch (39); xx. 9ff., Eutychus (40); xxii. 17, trance (41); xxiii. 11 and xxvii. 23, dreams (42, 43); xviii. 3ff., viper shaken off (44); xxviii. 8, 9, healings (45, 46).

Does the list seem formidable? Well, of these the first is the Ascension, a miracle of Jesus; 3, 8, 11, 32 are merely recurrent rhetorical phrases, about "signs and wonders"; ten (13, 17, 18, 22, 23, 34, 37, 41, 42, 43) are visions, trances, dreams; three (2, 24, 38) refer to tongue-speaking and the Holy Ghost; four (15, 26, 27, 28) are deeds of angels; two (29, 33) are deeds of the Holy Ghost; two (9, 39) are vague statements of many healings, as by magic; two (5, 36) are of quakings; two (10, 16) are apparently of divine or angelic power; two (12, 19) seem to be mere figurative expressions; one (25) is a prediction; one (35) is apparently an exorcism; others are deeds five (4, 6, 7, 20, 21) of Peter; one (14) of Philip; six (29, 30, 40, 44, 45, 46) of Paul.

The foregoing *catalogue raisonné* shows clearly that we are moving in a realm of the marvelous; but the great majority of the marvels are literary rather than historical. They are clearly picturesque statements, perhaps in every case, of the redactor who is bent on representing the beginnings of the Christian mission as accompanied by all sorts of displays of divine energy and extraordinary phenomena. This is perfectly obvious where there are mere vague statements of wonders, and all sorts of healings,—the writer is merely throwing a nimbus of reverential awe around the figures and achievements of his heroes, and does not expect to be taken seriously. This habit has not completely forsaken us matter-of-fact moderns. In editing the works of a rather commonplace prelate of uncertain character (Patrick Adamson, Archbishop of St. Andrews), Wilson allows himself to say, "he was a miracle of nature, and rather seemed to be the immediate production of God Almighty than born of a woman." If this had been said of Apollonius by Philostratus, Conybeare would doubtless insist that it taught the single procession of "the sage" direct from deity. It is very noteworthy that in the "We-sections," which seem to bring us closer than any other early Christian document to the genuine experiences of that era, this haze of marvel is completely dissipated, and we see the missionaries and apostles acting just as other rational men.

There remain then about ten or twelve miracles ascribed to

apostles; one to Philip, which may be dismissed on account of its vagueness, four to Peter, and five or six to Paul. Of the Petrine miracles the most impressive seems the double one wrought on Ananias and Sapphira. Yet it appears doubtful whether any miraculous power at all is here ascribed to Peter: he does not smite Ananias dead, he merely denounces the deception, and the deceiver falls dead. Satisfactory explanation is not easy. As an "allegorical fable" (Pfleiderer) the account is not clear, though some such motive may very well be present. Possibly violent remorse may have had fatal effects on some person or persons after actual exposure by some official. In any case, it is far from certain that any miraculous power is here ascribed to Peter.

In the case of Æneas, Peter declares "*Jesus Christ healeth thee.*" The writer seems to be merely giving a variant of the Gospel story of the palsied cured (Mark ii. 3-12; Luke v. 17-26), whose content is purely symbolical. This form is quite as correct as the Gospel form; in both cases it is Jesus that heals,—in the second, through the missionary who preaches the Jesus. This later form is more specific, assigning names and place—illustrating a tendency almost irresistible in secondary versions and observed every day.

The like may be said of the other miracle in the same connection, the raising of Tabitha (Dorcas): It is a variant of the Gospel story (Mark v. 35-43; Luke viii. 49-56); *talitha* has become *tabitha*, *egeire* (arise) has become *anastēthi* (stand up). The deed of the Jesus in the Gospel is here ascribed to the apostle of the Jesus; the difference is purely literary and formal, the meaning is the same.

Any one must note that these two wonder-stories appear here in rather strange connection, which has been a puzzle to commentators. It would not be in place to enter into any discussion hereof at this point, but if we knew the original connection in which they appeared, it might be illuminating.

The other Petrine miracle is the healing of the lame man at the so-called Beautiful Gate of the Temple. This is by far the capital miracle of Acts, ranging through two chapters, 3 and 4. That it is purely symbolical seems to lie on the open hand. The poor cripple is proselyte humanity waiting for the alms of such as worship in the temple, i. e., of Jewry. But the important point is that it is the name of Jesus Christ the Nazarean that works the cure (iii. 6, 16; iv. 10, 12), Peter merely pronounces the name, to which and to which alone all efficacy is emphatically ascribed. In no proper sense then is this a miracle of Peter. The writer has in

mind solely the saving might of the cult of the Jesus, as preached by the early missionaries, and of faith therein.

Of the six "miracles" of Paul the first is the blinding of Elymas. That it is spiritual blindness that is really in the writer's mind seems evident, it is a conflict of teachings that is described. This matter has already been discussed in *Der vorchristliche Jesus* (pp. 16ff.).

The next is the healing of the cripple at Lystra, apparently a doublet of the like healing by Peter. That the cure is a symbol of the conversion of pagandom to "the monotheistic Jesus-cult" (Deissmann), is made as plain as can be in the speech of Paul (xiv. 15-18); there is indeed no invocation of the name, but the equivalent preaching of pure monotheism.

The next is the exorcism at Philippi (xvi. 18). Here it is the overthrow of the oracle-system of heathendom that is set forth symbolically as the cure of the *Pythia* (said as plain as whisper in the ear by the words "a maiden having a spirit [of] Pytho"); the cure is again wrought by the name of Jesus Christ, which Paul merely pronounces. All this seems too transparent for argument.

Next we come to Eutychus, where there has certainly been overworking and where nothing supernatural is really asserted or implied.

The remaining cases of the viper and the healings seem also to be similar elaborations of the redactor, and do not really affirm or involve any display of miraculous power.

Herewith the list is closed. It is seen that there is no justification for thinking of the primitive preachers as wonder-workers. The prodigies distinctly attributed to them were spiritual achievements stated in picturesque symbolism. Had we the earliest accounts of their activity, we should perhaps detect little if any traces of the supernatural. The later redactors looking back in admiration upon two or three bygone generations of heroes very naturally used high-wrought language and described them as under divine guidance and moving in a luminous atmosphere of Holy Spirit. But the fact that they have no real physical prodigies to narrate (for the symbolical character of the miracles described is obvious and unmistakable), this fact shows decisively that there were *no such prodigies even in the tradition* with which the redactors had to deal. For it is incredible that if there were any such tradition of miracles it should have been so neglected by the glorifying redactor. In particular, if *there was any real instance of exorcism on the part of the apostles, why has no record thereof been preserved?* No!

the representation that the historicist finds himself compelled to make of Protochristians as a band of half-crazed fanatics, of jugglers and fakers and paranoiacs, practically all of whom we would confine either in the madhouse or in the state prison, this representation is without warrant and not only dishonors Protochristianity but also reduces the whole historic theory to absurdity.

But even this is not the whole story. It is a grave error to align the miraculous accounts in the Gospels with those in Acts, or rather to set the wonder-working of Jesus in line with that of Peter and Paul. The cases differ widely and at every point. The apostles do nothing in their own name or authority, they do all in the name and authority of Jesus. In fact, it is just as much Jesus that works the wonders in Acts as in the Gospels. In both it is the doctrine, the cult of the new deity, that routs the false gods and delivers humanity whether from disease or prison or death. Of course, there is no preaching without a preacher, and whether these triumphs be ascribed to Jesus working through the missionaries or working directly, is a question of rhetoric and of literary form. It is the difference between prose and poetry, between a history and a hymn. If any one can read the Gospels and Acts and still think that the career of Jesus is even at the widest remove parallel to that of Peter and Paul, we must say to him (with Goethe),

"The spirit-world is all unhidden,
Thy sense is shut, thy heart is dead."

However, we may forgive much in a work that expresses (on page 69) such noble and generous sentiments on the burning questions of sociology. Moreover, it seems needless to follow the author further in his criticism, so largely just, of this "Nineteenth Century Liberalism." More inviting is the next chapter on "Twentieth Century Mythical Idealism" or "Idealistic Monism," represented by Kalthoff and Drews in Germany, by Robertson and Anderson in England, by W. B. Smith (and he should have added Preserved Smith) in America. Inadequately stated, this view is still "heartily and sincerely commended in two respects."

1. "It is true to history in reminding us that Christianity began as a teaching *about* Jesus, not as the teaching *of* Jesus."
2. "The monist's view is also true to philosophy in making the chief concern of religion the welfare of the individual soul."

Such "respects" would not seem to be mere trifles even though monistic. The first appears to have fundamental importance. It would seem to confirm, while not accepting, the interpretation given in *Der vorchristliche Jesus of ta peri tou Iesou* as "the doctrine

concerning the Jesus." Professor Bacon insists strongly and justly on this distinction of the teaching *about* Jesus from the teaching *of* Jesus. It is in fact the essential distinction between substance and shadow, between being and non-being. The first is everywhere present in the New Testament and in early Christianity; it is the precious deposit of the primitive faith; the second, except as a form or investiture of the first, is *nowhere to be found*. No man can point to *anything* and say with reason or with well-instructed confidence, "this is a teaching *of* Jesus." Though the saying be put into the mouth of Jesus, that is only a literary form, the saying is still the evangelist's teaching *about* Jesus, precisely as the "oracle of Jehovah," so frequent on the lips of the prophets, is not strictly an oracle *of* Jehovah, but the prophet's own oracle *about* Jehovah, representing Jehovah as the prophet thought and taught him to be.

Amid much that is open-minded and just in this chapter one finds occasionally a remnant of error, of baseless affirmation. On page 96 we are told that "Saul's soul-devouring pursuit had been an ideal of personal redemption," which neither is proved nor can be. The exclusive zeal of Saul (Paul) as it appears in Acts is for the conversion of the world to monotheism from idolatry; there is no evidence of any such "soul-devouring pursuit" of "personal redemption." The thing that devours him is missionary ardor, not any selfish striving for his own salvation. Nor is there any good evidence that he was ever such an intense yearner for his soul's salvation. The fearful inner struggle depicted in Rom. vii. 14-25 is no evidence in point. There is very little likelihood that it details any personal experience of Paul's. The sentiments are stoical; they are found, sometimes almost word for word, in Epictetus; they belong to Greek ethics, not to the Pauline monotheistic mission. Far more verisimilar every way is the statement in Acts xxiii. 1: "I have lived before God in all good conscience until this day." These are not the words of a man that had ever been racked as described in Romans, but of a man singularly at one with himself throughout life. The "liberal" picture of Paul as a self-tormenter, writhing for years and torn asunder in the strife between the flesh and the spirit, is a mere fancy picture, as much like Paul as like Napoleon. About the circumstances of his conversion to the "new doctrine" we know simply nothing at all, and the shrewdest conjectures remain unlikely; there are too many ways in which it might have happened for any one way to be absolutely probable. But between the Paul of Acts and the Paul of the Epistles we must unhesitatingly prefer the former.

With much of Bacon's vindication of Peter (or Petrinism) as against Paul (or Paulinism) we may sympathize, but his effort to show that Peter must have known Jesus personally fails *in toto*. He says, "About all we know of Peter's experience is the bare fact that the risen Christ was 'manifested to him.'" If so, then historicism is hopeless. From such a "*bare fact*," whose real meaning and sense can not be determined, at least in any physical terms, it is wholly and plainly impossible to infer that there was ever a man Jesus. The manifestation of the risen Christ may very well refer to a spiritual vision, to an intellectual apprehension of the doctrine about Jesus, the doctrine that God was now to be revealed to the whole world, to Jew and Gentile, in a new aspect, under a new person, the aspect, the person of the Saviour-God Jesus. The least likely of all interpretations of such expressions is that they refer to a notion that God had resuscitated a dead man and raised him on high to the throne of the universe. Neither Peter nor Paul ever entertained such an extravagant idea.

Strangest of all is Bacon's attempt to ground the historicity of Jesus on the rite of baptism, a grounding that one can not comprehend. He seems to assume the very thing in dispute, thus: "What leads this group of men who had companied with Jesus since the baptism of John, etc." But where is it proved they "had companied with Jesus"? He insists "that the adoption of this Johannine rite" indicates "an overwhelming sense of moral unworthiness" in Peter and the rest. But this is far from clear, and in any case, what of it? All of our author's discussion along here seems to state many facts excellently well, but none of it has aught to do with the historicity of Jesus.

All the facts are far more easily understood without than with any "historical Jesus." The author presents no real argumentation, he merely throws in here and there an assertion, which remains to the end a mere assertion still. E. g., "had not the disciples learned through contact with the historic Jesus as the only way to the realization of this ideal such moral consecration as *his* precepts, *his* life, *his* death exemplified" (p. 112), for which there is not the faintest shadow of a shade of warrant. The impression derived from such vague pronouncements is that the author himself is keenly conscious how infeasible it is to drag up and hitch his premises to his far foregone conclusion, yet with manful strain he struggles on at the impossible linkage, simply because there is nothing else to do (unless, indeed, he should back down his horses!).

Queerest of all, though, is the representation of the rite of

baptism as adopted "by the first followers of Jesus" after "the tragedy of the cross," and of "their being now 'baptized every one of them into the name of Jesus, *confessing their sins*'" (p. 105). The italics are Bacon's, and one is curious to learn whence came his quotation, "baptized. . . sins." Surely not from the New Testament. The italicized phrase is found only in Matt. iii. 6; Mark i. 5, "And were baptized by him in the Jordan (river), confessing their sins," The rest of his quotation is found only in the address to the Jews, Acts ii. 38, "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you on the name of Jesus Christ unto remission of your sins," but Peter says naught about his own "moral unworthiness," naught about baptizing himself and the other "first followers of Jesus." This example of conflation is interesting as showing how easily and completely the sense may change under redaction.

Chapter IV, on the "Characterization of Jesus," seems to have been written in 1913, whereas the lectures were delivered 1911. Apparently Professor Bacon has lived long in these "two years," both wisely and well. Designed to "bring the discussion down to date," it also brings it down from the clouds and back to reason. Beginning with vigorous re-assertion, "Jesus was an actuality," "the Gnostic sects which sacrificed history to myth. . . perished," "the catholic faith, strongly buttressed upon historical tradition, survived," Bacon admits that "myth may serve," that "it *has* served the cause of religious uplift," yet he prefers "the real objective fact"—very much as the materialists in philosophy prefer atoms to ideas and mechanical integrators to the theorems of the calculus. He admits that the "Quest of the Historical Jesus" "is difficult," and quotes from Bousset's *Kyrios Christos* (p. 143) that "the moral and religious personal character of Jesus had no influence or significance whatever for the religious feeling of Paul." He might have added that Bousset says (p. 144) that Paul's idea (*Bild*) of the "Lord Jesus" is not taken from "the earthly life of Jesus," that his "Jesus" is "the preexistent supramundane Christ," that "the subject to all these predicates"—"meekness, obedience, love, sincerity, fidelity even to death on the cross"—"is not the 'historic' Jesus." It is vain then for Bacon still to cling to the notion that Paul "surely had some very distinctly definable 'moral and religious character' of Jesus in mind." It is surely the wish that fathers the thought. If such a lynx-eyed historicist as Bousset can not see it, we may be sure it is not there to see.

Proceeding, Bacon tells us it "must be frankly admitted" that "Paul himself is no longer in immediate contact with the historical Jesus."

He had "received" by tradition "from others the doctrine that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures" (1 Cor. xv. 4), hence he had to view "Jesus's earthly character and fate from a more or less theoretical standpoint." Now remember that Paul's conversion is placed apparently only a few months after the crucifixion, and then ask what it means to admit that "so early as the time when Paul himself 'received' his impressions of the historic Jesus, they were already idealized, conventionalized, conformed to a theoretical standard." It means that "the historic Jesus" had already disappeared the first few months after the crucifixion, and a dogmatic, doctrinal, theoretic Jesus had taken its place in the minds of "the first followers of Jesus." Believe it who can. Such a miracle is without a precedent or parallel in the history of our race. It can be accepted only in the very last resort, after every other attempt at explanation has failed hopelessly.

Even this is not all: the word translated "received" (*parelabon*) means more, it is "the technical term for transmission of traditional teaching" (p. 129). But how can there be any formation of tradition, still less any handing down of "traditional teaching," in the course of less than a single year (or at the *very extremest* six¹ years, supposing with Wendt the crucifixion and the conversion to be 29 and 35 A. D.). Six¹ years would seem just as inadequate as six months for the formation and development of such a history-effacing dogmatic tradition; to suppose the historic portrait of the most impressive personality the world has ever seen to be effaced in such a brief space or time is to suppose the inconceivable. Yet Bacon confesses and denies not: "The fact is undeniable that his (Paul's) conception of the historic Jesus has already passed through at least one stage of idealization. The admission may well seem unwelcome."—But only to preconception, only to such as are set for the defense of the indefensible, "the historic Jesus."

Bacon now passes over to Mark and sadly admits that "we have but Mark and Q, to set over against the scanty allusions of Paul; and neither Mark nor Q attempts a really historical pen-portrait":

"The Germans in Greek
Are sadly to seek

: : : : : : : :
: : : : : : : :

None save only Hermann,
And Hermann's a German."

¹We must change this to *three* or even *two*, since Deissmann's Gallio-inscription retires the incident in Acts xviii. 12-17 back to A. D. 50-51.

Even Mark and Q "are works of religious edification," "defenses of the existing faith," "they too have their theoretical conceptions of Jesus's character, career and fate, and set in relief what bears out the theory." Amid all this crash of falling "liberal" contentions, amid dislimning systems and creeds, Professor Bacon "stands unshook," declaring in italics, "*the spirit survives.*" But what is the meaning of this? Our author fails to make clear. What spirit of Jesus is attested as the spirit of an historical man? None at all. The three spirit-portraits of Paul, Mark, and Q are all "conventionalized, idealized," none can make any pretension to historic truth; moreover, they are discrepant as can be. Says Bacon (p. 158). "The contrast between this (Mark's) conception and that of Paul could hardly be stronger within the limits of fidelity to historic fact." But it is certain as anything in the whole subject, and it is repeatedly admitted in effect by Bacon, that nowhere in any of these three "conventionalized," "idealized," "theoretical" representations is there any question at all of "fidelity to historic fact"; the portraits show no trace thereof whatever. Nor does Bacon make any serious attempt to recover any trait even the most spiritual. On page 167 he tells us that at so early a date as that of "the Q source," "the adoption of such an ideal (the Isaian Servant-Son, the Alexandrine Wisdom-Spirit) as the basis of a characterization of Jesus is not within the province of poetic fancy. Had it not corresponded with actual recollection it could not have survived."² Here our author quietly assumes everything in dispute, namely, that the Jesus was historic! that there *was* some "actual recollection"! To be sure, had Q's idealization, or Paul's, or Mark's, contradicted "actual recollection," it could hardly have survived;² but neither would it ever have been formed. It did not offend any "actual recollection" for the good and sufficient reason that there was *none to offend*. The three widely discrepant portraits (and he might as well have added the Johannine as a fourth, wholly unlike all the others) were drawn freely without the least constraint of "actual recollection" or biographic tradition, and they are intelligible in all their details, when and only when they are referred not to any dimly remembered historic original ineffaceably stamped on the disciples' consciousness and straightway *effaced* utterly in less than a lustrum, but to the subjective conditions prevailing among the early Christians and varying this way and that from man to man.

² This just admission ends historicism; for it is certain and virtually conceded in various liberal quarters that the earliest certified characterization of Jesus sharply contradicts any possible "actual recollection."

Herewith then we close this review. Bacon's final chapter is full of wisdom and of brave, honest, outspoken admissions. In every respect it contrasts most favorably with the work of Conybeare, simultaneously published. It is especially gratifying to see that the Yale Professor recognizes the famous "Come unto me" of Matt. xi. 25ff. as a "Hymn of Wisdom," as already set forth in *Ecce Deus* (p. 166), and that he discards the supposed naïveté (!) of Mark, declaring that "in Mark Jesus is the strong Son of God," where "Son of God" with a very capital S, does not mean a son of a god or of God, but means "the Second God the beloved SON OF GOD," who had entered human thought and human speech as early as 340 B. C. (*Corpus Hermeticum*, VII), never thenceforth to depart therefrom.